Christian Education

Vol. XII MARCH, 1929 No. 6

THE RELATION BETWEEN RELIGION AND EDUCATION

Henry Nelson Snyder
President of Wofford College

Kirtley F. Mather
Professor of Geology, Harvard University

Charles W. Gilkey
Dean of Religion, The University of Chicago

The Council of Church Boards of Education

HEADQUARTERS

111 Fifth Avenue New York City

Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary

———— ————, University Secretary

Alfred Williams Anthony, Associate Secretary

OFFICERS FOR 1929

PRESIDENT—Dr. B. C. Davis

VICE-PRESIDENT—Dr. A. E. Kirk

RECORDING SECRETARY—Mr. Harry T. Stock

TREASURER—Bank of New York and Trust Company

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Drs. F. E. Stockwell, J. H. Bradford, Frank W. Padelford, Robert L. Kelly, *ex-officio*.

BOARD OF ADVISORS

Dr. Charles H. Judd, Director, The University of Chicago.
President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College.
Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, Columbia University.
Bishop Francis J. McConnell, New York City.
Mr. John Stites, Louisville Trust Company, Louisville.
Judge David F. Matchett, Illinois Appellate Court, Chicago.
President Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College.

STANDING COMMITTEES

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: John L. Seaton (three years), C. C. McCracken (two years), R. L. Kelly (one year).

COLLEGES: H. O. Pritchard, James E. Clarke, H. H. Sherman, S. K. Mosemman.

NORMAL SCHOOLS: Katherine C. Foster, Mary E. Markley.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE: M. Willard Lampe, George R. Baker, Frances P. Greenough, Katherine C. Foster, Mary E. Markley, W. F. Sheldon, H. T. Stock, C. P. Harry, J. M. Culbreth, C. Leslie Glenn, Jos. C. Todd, J. H. Powell.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: W. S. Bovard, W. A. Harper, H. H. Sweets.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION ON RELIGION: Charles H. Brent, M. Willard Lampe, John W. Suter, Jr.

Christian Education

Vol. XII MARCH, 1929 No. 6

ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

ALFRED WMS. ANTHONY
ISMAR J. PERITZ
HERBERT E. EVANS
GARDINER M. DAY

Published Monthly, Omitting July, August and September, at Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.
By The Council of Church Boards of Education in the United States of America
111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

October, 1928, to June, 1929

Entered as second-class matter March 29, 1926, at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is $1.50 per annum; ten or more subscriptions $1.00 each; 25 cents for single copies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Editorials

The Leaven in the Lump 317

Impressions of Educational Week, 1929 318

Is It Worth While? *Alfred Williams Anthony* 320

The Place of Religion in Higher Education

Henry Nelson Snyder 324

Kirtley F. Mather 330

Charles W. Gilkey 339

University Notes, *Herbert E. Evans* 350

The World Students Live In, *M. Willard Lampe* 352

Department of Biblical Instruction

The Relation of the Bible to Courses in History, *Maude L. Strayer* 362

The Relation of Archeology to the Teaching of the Bible, *Lewis Bayles Paton* 367

Report of the College Committee of the Council of Church Boards of Education, *Edward E. Rall* 377

Report of the Committee on Normal Schools of the Council of Church Boards of Education, *Katharine C. Foster* 379

Report of the Committee on Religious Education of the Council of Church Boards of Education, *W. A. Harper* 386

Trends in Theological Thought, *Gardiner M. Day* 392

The Worker's Bookshelf 397

Christian Education

Vol. XII MARCH, 1929 No. 6

EDITORIAL

The Leaven in the Lump

The very interesting observation was made by Dr. A. E. Kirk in the opening devotional service of the Annual Meeting of the Council at Chattanooga that the principal function of the Council of Church Boards of Education is to serve as a leaven in leavening the lump of American higher education.

The observation in addition to being interesting discloses rare insight. To inspire others to achieve in the field of Christian education is far more important than to be the immediate instrument for such achievement. This is basal educational philosophy and registers educational practice at its fullest fruition. It is not necessary to attempt to trace the causal relationship, but even though the wind bloweth where it listeth, some causal relationship nevertheless is there. It is enough to make the more superficial observations of some of the ways and means in which the religious spirit is permeating American education.

That some twenty-five or thirty churches of Chattanooga opened their pulpits for the presentation of the message of Christian education was significant, though not unexpected. In spite of the epidemic of influenza, not more prevalent in Chattanooga than in many other American cities, the attendance at these services was highly gratifying.

Perhaps it was a little more unexpected for the American Association for the Advancement of Science to invite the churches of New York to consider the problems of scientific advance in relation to their own of advancing religion, as the congregations met on the Sabbath before their annual meeting. No more practical demonstration of the unity of science and religion, in the estimation of the leaders of American scientific advance, could have been given.

And now comes the announcement that the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, which is to hold its fifty-ninth annual session at Cleveland, February 24–28, inclusive, invites the ministers of Cleveland and of America to preach on the convention thesis—"How Can the Public Schools Better Serve Democracy, Increasingly Produce a Higher Type of Citizen?" The climax of their program comes on Thursday—"How Can We Realize the Thesis Ideal, by a Better Plan for Character Education?" The invitation is broadcasted to all clergymen everywhere, who are referred to as the "Uplift Faculty of American Youth," to join hands with the public school leaders in making the young person of this generation into a high type of citizen.

Nor are these seeds being cast on stony ground. Americans are interested in religion, most of all in the religion of Jesus. A recent issue of the *Publisher's Weekly* shows that next to fiction religion supplies the largest number of titles on the publishers' lists. The titles in religion surpass those in science and history and education, and even biography, and the further fact is disclosed that even the titles in fiction are on the decrease, the peak of production in fiction having been reached so long ago as 1901.

In any event, the lump is being leavened. Dr. Kirk spoke with wisdom.—*R. L. K.*

IMPRESSIONS OF EDUCATIONAL WEEK, 1929

Upon one who has been mentally quickened and in no small measure supplied with knowledge by attending the gatherings of "Educational Week" three years in succession, the meetings at Chattanooga made the following impressions:

1. Educators are venturesome, busily experimenting. Not satisfied with present attainments, they are seeking better methods. As a group they are less rigidly conservative than any other group with which the observer is accustomed to meet, ecclesiastical, financial or social. Scores of colleges and universities might be mentioned, but, to any one who knows, the following names suggest at once important educational experiments, now in progress: Antioch, Wells, Whittier, Claremont, Rollins, Chicago, Iowa, Harvard.

2. Great teachers are not dead. As acclaimed by four authoritative groups, well-nigh final in estimating the qualities of a teacher—(1) undergraduates, (2) faculty, (3) alumni, and (4) trustees—"great teachers" are not mere memories and traditions, but are living, inspiring guides of youth to-day, proportionally as numerous as ever.

3. The chief problem is to discover and enlist more of these men. "G. P's" they are called down in Florida, "Golden Personalities," because of the use of the term by the president of Rollins College.

4. There is something of a revolt against instructors bearing degrees, especially the degree of Ph.D., with a fear lest the degree, though showing attainment on the outside, may reveal only the capacity of research within.

Sympathy, understanding, inspiration, patience, kindliness, friendship, personality are demanded.

5. There was an almost pitiful confession made at the time when standardizing agencies were reviewed. It was shown that rating was largely a matter of mechanics—the size of the campus, the number of buildings, the dollars in the endowment fund, the books in the library, the degrees worn by members of the faculty, the ratios of instructors to undergraduates, and so on.

If an anxious parent were to ask, "To which college shall I send my son?" the formulated answer, in the terms of data at hand, is, "Look at this magnificent plant; behold these impressive names and degrees!"

No one has yet the technique of evaluating the output. The authorities say, "Here is so much of a college to put your boy into"; and the parents retort, "But tell me, how much of that college will get into my boy?"

Is there a satisfactory way of analyzing and testing the graduated product at certain periods after graduation, two years, five years, ten years, twenty-five years, so that it may be said, "*This* is what was done during those four precious years of youth."—*A. W. A.*

IS IT WORTH WHILE?

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY

Is the "Campaign of Perseverence" proving profitable, at least in its use of printer's ink?

The time has come to take account of stock, go through the inventory and cast up the profits and losses.

Since February, 1926, already more than three years, the writer has been furnishing to these pages an article each month on the general subject of finance as related to charitable organizations. Themes have been chosen, occasioned by some specific inquiry or problem brought to the writer's attention. There has, however, been a constructive tendency in three specific directions:

I. There has been an effort to indicate the value of *cooperation* and actually to secure cooperation between five groups of people. This aim has been stated again and again. Has it been made plain? Has it become a tiresome subject? Should it now be dropped?

The five groups are

(a) Those who seek funds, such as colleges, mission boards, and all kinds of charities.

(b) Those who have funds, and they, of course, are the wealthy and the near-wealthy, and even those who cannot be called wealthy at all, yet have an income and some means and a big heart.

(c) Those who know the law, interpret the law, and write the legal documents which express agreements, contracts, trusts and testamentary dispositions. These are lawyers.

(d) Those who serve professionally as trustees and, because trained and experienced, possess expert skill. These are trust companies and banks with fiduciary powers. These corporations and the persons who administer them have intimate daily relations with people of wealth.

(e) Those whose profession it is to provide for the future welfare of wives and children and family dependents. These are life insurance underwriters, who are now learning that it is

good business for them and for the world, that they make provision for charitable objects, dear to a man's heart, as well as for his family and heirs.

II. There has been an effort to discover and point out *the instruments* best fitted for people in their differing conditions of wealth. The constant aim has been to make public giving convenient, safe and effective, to avoid obscurities, illegalities and waste. Five methods have been dwelt upon.

(1) *Testamentary Gifts.* Gifts written into a document which is to take effect after death, a document which we call a "Will." Everybody must at some time die; everybody should before death write and execute a Will, making final disposition of all earthly possessions.

(2) *Gifts by Life Insurance.* Those who have no capital funds, or at best small capital funds, may give out of recurring income a sum of money which, if paid as premium upon a life insurance policy, may result at the time of death in a large sum of money accumulated by the insurance company. Such a sum of money may be a most significant benefaction and serve as a memorial to the giver.

(3) *Conditional Gifts.* Those who have accumulated some funds and have become incapacitated for earning and require an added income, may give their entire capital, or a considerable portion of it, to a charity under an agreement that annually, or semi-annually, they shall receive back from the charitable organization an "annuity," more than the earnings of their gift and more adequately commensurate to their needs, and yet not sufficient to exhaust the gift itself during lifetime. In such a case, the residue of the gift, conditioned as it has been by the recurring payments, yet remains a benefaction.

(4) *Living Trusts.* The assignment, while living, of funds out of capital to a trustee who shall administer the same and pay the income to the trustor during his life and, at the close of his life, transfer the fund itself to the charitable organization named in the trust agreement, or do other similar things as stated in the agreement. By this instrument the donor, or trustor, may enjoy the income of his capital while at the same time making his capital legally the property of the beneficiary, simply held

for a time in the hands of a trustee. In this way, he who sets up a living trust actually executes his own will and administers his own estate while still living.

(5) *Absolute Gifts.* Then, of course, there are the gifts direct and absolute, which may be made at any time from the donor to the donee, either of money or of securities, and then the transaction becomes complete. Such a gift, if without restrictions and at once available, becomes prized beyond all others, for all others at their best, ultimately result in this simple transfer of cash or its equivalent to the organization to be benefited, but after delay and perhaps with some diminution.

III. There has been an effort to influence people to make provision for *posthumous discretion.* A man who dies may have been wise while living. Too often he attempts to project decisions which appeared to him wise far beyond the time of his death into circumstances and conditions of which he has no knowledge or forewarnings, wherein his opinions and decisions are entirely out of place, because then entirely unfitted for application. Wisdom of one day and generation may be folly of days far ahead in the midst of succeeding generations. Needs once existing do not always exist.

It is wise for every person and every institution having far reaches into the future, to make provision so that when the future arrives the wisdom of the future may make use of all of the utilities and the benefits then existing, so that utilities and benefits may be discreet, efficient and valuable and fitted to needs as they exist. Too often the "dead hand" grips the institutions of men not with good but with blight and with curse. Trust agreements, statements and contracts, which are to be complied with in the future, should have some provision by which they may be modified so as to fit future circumstances.

The Uniform Trust for Public Uses has been persistently advocated in these pages because it, above all other documents hitherto drawn and presented for use, embodies this principle of future discretion lodged in the trustee who, with the advice of properly chosen competent persons acquainted with conditions subsequently existing, may direct the application of benefactions to uses which will prove to be blessings.

Now, with the statement of objectives, have the utterances and the writings of the three years past been worth while? Who reads them? The writer does not know. Who has found here suggestions of value for him or his institution? The writer does not know. Should this series of articles be continued? If continued, should they be modified as to form or contents? If modified, in what direction should they be modified? What other or better purposes could be secured by using all of this good white space on these pages for other words and other sentiments?

Will those who read these lines write to the writer and give him advice, expressing an opinion and judgment, or a wish? The writer is Alfred Williams Anthony. The office where he sits and in which he may be consulted, is Room 65, 105 East 22d Street, New York City.

May he have a word?

Is this literary output worth while?

Dr. Franklin W. Johnson, formerly professor in Teachers College, Columbia University, has accepted the presidency of Colby College. Dr. Johnson is an alumnus of Colby, which boasts an unusually distinguished group of living alumni including General Herbert M. Lord, Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States; Frank W. Alden, New York City, assistant secretary of the Home Insurance Company; Jeremiah E. Burke, of Boston, superintendent of schools; Randall J. Gordon, of Cincinnati, superintendent of schools; Merle Crowell, of New York City, editor of *The American Magazine;* Everett C. Herrick, of Newton, Mass., president of Newton Theological Institution; Franklin W. Johnson, of New York City, president of Colby College; George Horace Lorimer, of Philadelphia, editor of *The Saturday Evening Post;* John E. Nelson, of Augusta, Maine, Representative from Maine, and George Otis Smith, of Washington, D. C., director of the United States Geological Survey. These men have agreed to serve as members of the General Committee to secure additional endowment and buildings to the amount of $500,000.

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

President HENRY NELSON SNYDER, Wofford College

It has not been so long ago since religion held its place almost anywhere as a simple matter of positive dogmatics, and its programme of appeal was clearly marked out. Its dogmatics and its programmes were accepted, not questioned. In spite of certain differences that separated one church from another, the denominations spoke almost the same dialect and used nearly the same methods of keeping people good and making them better. Almost without exception they had what may be called a theological explanation of the evil in human nature and the ways and means of getting rid of it, and believed that there could be no sound morality without the renovation that resulted from a profound and violent emotional disturbance.

In those older days people at least thought they had something that enabled them to overcome evil and conferred upon them the power to live a righteous life. They may have been mistaken, but they went on affirming a sense of the nearness of God, the reality of their experiences, and not a few of them did manage, to use their quaint phrase, to conquer the world, the flesh, and the devil. However, things have happened and they have happened fast, so that there are those who say that what I have here but hinted at is out-moded and out-dated, and that if we are trying to find a place for religion in higher education or anywhere else in the modern world, we shall have to discover another sort of religion—one better adapted to the newer conditions we are now facing.

When we consider these newer conditions, there is no way of avoiding a mention of the scientific approach to all life that is so fundamental to present day thinking. The world can never be to educated people what it once was because our geology, our astronomy, our biology, our physics, our chemistry, our psychology are what they are. To say this is to be not so much concerned about the facts they have contributed to a knowledge of ourselves and our relations to the universe as it is to be concerned with the influence of the scientific mood and attitude. This mood and attitude mean that everything is subject to investigation, and nothing is to be accepted as true until the real facts about it

have been gathered, sifted, and classified. Now religion itself has at last come to grips with the scientific mood and attitude. The outer expressions of the religious life are being examined in the scientific manner, and the inner motives studied just as if they were no different from any of the other instincts and impulses of human nature. Moreover, under this kind of scrutiny the facts of the religious life and experience are valid for guidance and use, not because of any supernatural sanction that may give worth to them, but because they have been practically proved to be serviceable for the control of conduct and the shaping of character.

As a result, the student who enters the field of psychology, biology, anthropology, and comparative religion, to go no further, cannot escape a sense of conflict between his traditional views and the scientific approach to religion and the experiences that belong to it. And this, at bottom, is not so much a conflict between religion and science as it is a deeper conflict between conceptions of just what is religion. It is, however, the scientific spirit and attitude brought over from other fields of research and applied to the sphere of religion that is responsible for this sense of conflict. It is impossible to read very far in the literature of religious discussion without realizing acutely that religious thinking has been invaded by ideas quite at variance with but recently accepted notions of what really is religion. In a word, we are enveloped in an atmosphere in which there is the jarring confusion that comes of the antagonisms between new and old ideals, though practical standards and aims may remain virtually the same.

Out of such a conflict there inevitably grows a sense of uncertainty in the matter of religious faith, not to say religious doctrine. Where there is so much investigation of religion in the hard, dry, factual scientific manner, with the accompanying suspicion of sentiment and emotion as safe guides to conduct and no little doubt as to the validity of what has been understood as religious experience—it would be too much to expect a conquering affirmative faith. On the other hand, it would be surprising if with the modern approach to religion and the sense of conflict that grows out of it, we were not creating conditions that must make for a very definite sense of uncertainty in the matter of even a few essentials of faith.

Such a conflict and uncertainty are rather apt to induce a mood of disillusionment, not to say cynicism, in students as they consider present-day religious thought. Their elders have not escaped it. The conflicts of religions as well as the conflicts within the newer views themselves not only contribute to a sense of uncertainty in the matter of faith, but tend to lead even further to a sense of doubt as to any sort of religion at all. In particular, the general critical-mindedness that is characteristic of our day can easily be destructive of religious faith of any kind with those who have not yet worked out a creed based on the newer standpoints of understanding. Indeed, students, with their intellectual immaturities and the necessary limitations of their knowledge, may be simply confused by the discussions that are going on about religion, particularly so when they themselves are made the subjects of investigations that seem to assume that there is much doubt as to whether the kind of religion they and their parents have had is any religion at all. The result is that they, too, become critical-minded, or think they ought to be, and share in this wide-spread mood of disillusionment as to the vitality and practical power of the religious ideals and standards of a yesterday that is said to be passing. If the findings of the questionnaire processes and of the soul-probings by experts at summer conferences are to be trusted, our college youth are standing with disillusioned eyes at the parting of the ways, looking critically back upon the faith of their fathers that will not fit the demands of the modern world and wistfully forward into a future that must have another sort of faith—a faith yet unannounced by an authentic voice out of the jangling babel of tongues. The new day still awaits its prophet.

They are not greatly helped in their troubles when they discover that the authority of objective reality sits enthroned in every other field of knowledge and experience they are invited to enter. As much of their science as they are permitted to handle is of the very stuff of reality, and there is no compelling authority except that of proved facts; they are introduced into a psychology in which personality is a materialistically wrought tangle of impulses that predetermine behavior, thought but "a dance of the molecules in the brain-cells," love but an expression "of the twitchings of the viscera," life itself but "a temporary chem-

ical episode," and into a study of comparative religion that translates the religious motives, of whatever kind, into old ghosts of primitive fears and wonderings out of man's semi-animal ancestry; when the young student turns to literature, in the interest of reality human greatness is "debunked," and they who served to make history are created of very common clay and no better than the worst of us when the scientific microscope of "the biography of assassination" peeps into the intimacies of their lives; in their history one hears no longer the trumpet notes of the great spiritual ideals of liberty and fraternity that once called men to sacrifice and service and accounted for large movements of human progress, but rather one reads the drab facts of economic and industrial struggles wholly for selfish ends; and the fiction that the student reads, and in not a few instances made a part of his courses in literature, lifts the curtain upon the workings of a human nature all compounded of complexes rooted in the dark and gruesome control of some sort of subconscious mind; and, finally, if he knows his Bible at all it is as just one other collection of ancient folk-tales and Jesus himself a creation of the accumulated dreams of the human imagination.

If the world of higher education is thus questing relentlessly to discover the authority of reality in every field of thought and experience, it seems that religion must either take its place subject to the same standards and tests or it must be accepted as an experience different from all other human experiences, and, therefore, subject to its own special standards and tests. Dare we venture to believe that the latter alternative is possible? Already every mood and attitude resulting from modern methods of research and thinking are present to force a questioning of the validity of hitherto held religious conceptions for practical living in a changed and changing world. This at least means that the type of religion that can hold a place in higher education must speak with the authority of reality and in a language modern enough to be understood by those who do their thinking in the terms of present-day experiences. And it may be that such a language will amount to just a newer way of expressing, after all, the ancient verities of the faith that men have really lived by in the past. This faith has survived other changes in human thought, not so rapid and varied perhaps as those we are now

undergoing, and yet in a way as profoundly disturbing. To hold to it with conviction, to affirm it on the authority of experience, to teach it with all the light that the newer knowledge offers, and to live it in the dynamic power of transformed personalities—this is the privilege of those who would make higher education an agency of generous and saving service. A sense of the presence of God in the world and in the individual soul, a faith in justice and righteousness as the only security for the orderly and safe ongoing of society, in love as the solvent and reconciler of human differences, in the salvability of every human soul, and in the spirit and truth of Jesus Christ as the hope of the world—surely such a faith can be made reasonable enough and challenging enough to win to its affirmation those who, in the field of higher education, would lead youth through the devious ways of the modern world to a rich and enriching realization of their human capacities as religious as well as intellectual beings.

Anything less than this is to chill with an arctic blight the warm enthusiasms of youth, and to cabin and confine its noblest idealisms in a narrow house of drab walls with no high towers toward which to climb for outlook. To permit young men and young women in college to be subdued to the color of an intellectual environment, so hostile to the glowing moods of religious experience and aspiration that they describe the expression of such moods as "bunk," "applesauce," or "bologney," is to infect higher education with a poison far more deadly than the older atheism and agnosticism. Without apology, without timidity, without a debilitating uncertainty, the time has come for the assertion that religion is the one thing needful to make higher education safe enough to expose youth to it. And in saying this we are thinking how unfair to youth it is for his disillusioned elders to forget his instinctive responsiveness to the very appeals which religion makes, and, further, to forget the moral perils to which he is subject as he passes from adolescence into manhood. His very nature demands emotional rather than intellectual satisfaction, and not even the heroisms of the athletic field, not to say the cynicism of an unripe intellectualism and the facts of biology, psychology, or geology, all combined, can make him quite at ease with himself and at home in his world so long as he has no faith to lift his spirit Godward and no challenge of high and hard spiritual achievement calling to what he knows is the best in him.

So here they come trooping, *en masse,* into our institutions of higher learning, the men and women of tomorrow, and how rich a provision is made for them! There are dormitories with no comfort lacking, almost luxurious in their appointments, laboratories for opening every secret of nature, libraries from which no smallest ray of knowledge is excluded if it may be found on a printed page, gymnasia for correcting every weakness of the body and developing its every power, stadia and athletic fields for the display of physical prowess of every kind for the glory of Alma Mater and the amusement of the public, activities without number that cater to youthful tastes and interests, learned men called instructors and professors with great books to their credit, dispensing facts from all the fields of knowledge with the authority of specialists who have mastered in the scientific way a separate segment of one of these fields. There is no other adventure comparable to the entrance of students into this college and university world. Whichever way they turn in it, there is something profoundly appealing to many sides of their nature, and they cannot come out of it without being permanently and radically stamped with its influences. In the midst of all this color and romance of adventure, shall religion be but a "pilgrim grey," standing dimly in the shadows on the sidelines, shyly asking a modest place in the big game? Suppose students, facing this wealth of opportunity, fail at least to realize that the college has a soul that is forever seeking to find the Divine in all life and in all knowledge, and counts everything as lost unless it leads the soul of youth to come to that beginning of all wisdom which is the fear of the Lord—if students fail to realize this, shall we not speak of the education we are offering not as higher education, but rather as lower education? Our task and privilege, then, is to put first things first, and this only means that we shall place a genuinely affirmative, even militant, religious faith at the heart of the educational process, and when, having done with our questionings about irrelevant matters, our uncertainties, our curious timidities, our fearsome mood as to what science is doing to us, we actually dare assert such a faith, youth will respond as to the call of a trumpet, and it will be once again:

> Onward Christian soldiers, marching as to war,
> With the cross of Jesus leading on before.

PROFESSOR KIRTLEY F. MATHER, Department of Geology, Harvard University

The number of required or optional chapel services and the broad curriculum of the numerous departments of religious education in American colleges and universities, indicate that at the present time religion occupies a quantitatively important place in our higher educational system. No one who is familiar with the courses of study and campus life of the institutions of higher learning can fail to appreciate the wide opportunity for the expansion of knowledge and inspiration in the field of religion which is there provided. Those who fear that religion is being crowded out of college education base that fear either on the belief that the quality of religious instruction is unsatisfactory, or on the assumption that college students fail to take advantage of the opportunities which are provided for them.

These two points of criticism are intimately related to each other. College students devote their time to those pursuits which are intrinsically interesting to them, or which may lead to rewards which they believe to be of value to themselves, or which are presented by men and women who display enticing personalities. The quality of the teacher is ofttimes more important in determining selection of courses or allotment of time than the inherent merit of the subject. But this is as it should be; college students will take advantage of their opportunities for religious education to a degree which correlates closely with the true value of the subject matter and the real ability of those who present it to them. In the long run, the abilities of the teacher in this as in any field will be proportional to the intrinsic merit of the subject itself.

The value of religion in a college curriculum depends entirely upon one's concept of the subject. If religion is simply a compendium of doctrines, a code of morality, a traditionally determined and fully understood attitude toward life, in short a system "once for all delivered to the saints," or otherwise superimposed "from above" upon humankind, then it has little or no place in higher education. Students of religion so conceived need only to memorize the lore preserved for them amongst the traditions of the past; and memory training is one of the least

of the values inherent in college and university experiences. Committing to memory a catechism, a creed, a biblical passage, or a code of regulations may possibly be an important phase of "lower education," but "higher education" has far more consequential responsibilities.

College and university instruction finds its greatest importance in the inculcation of scientific habits of mind and in the consideration of the frontiers of knowledge where the correlation and interpretation of facts and experiences are still debatable and where the horizon of human understanding is steadily expanding. Only insofar as religion supplies material for such processes and demands critical examination of tentative conclusions is it qualified to compete with the other subjects of the curriculum and the other interests of campus life. If religion finds its authority solely or primarily in the words spoken by the ancient prophets and priests or inscribed in the holy documents of antiquity, rather than in the facts and experiences of life, it can take no large place in higher education during this scientific age.

But if religion is a way of life, if the religious life is the richest, truest, most valuable kind of life which man may live in the sort of universe in which he finds himself, then the place of religion in higher education is an all-important one. Thus conceived, religion challenges the best abilities of college administration and faculty as well as college student. It summons to its aid all departments of the university. It welcomes every advance of knowledge in every field of science. It approves every honest effort to "debunk" history. It profits by every thoughtful experiment in social relations.

Religious instruction thus becomes much more than mere Bible study or the training of boy scout leaders. It lays hold on truth, wherever and whenever it may be found. It claims an appropriately large place within the college curriculum and amongst the activities of the campus. It appeals to the mind as well as to the emotions of the student.

For theology may be just as scientific as geology. Geology is a collection of beliefs and ideas concerning the present condition and past history of the earth. It deals with the measurable transformations of matter and energy; it observes the changes which overtake tangible objects in time and space. It deduces

from observable facts the nature and modes of activity of the forces which determine our material environment. Similarly, theology is a collection of beliefs and ideas concerning the moral qualities of the universe, the spiritual phases of life, and the relations between man and the administration of the universe. It deals with the non-measurable realities of which man is becoming increasingly aware, as well as with the moral values inherent within the measurable transformations to which living organisms are subject. It deduces from its observations and evaluations the purposes of life, the goals toward which men should strive, the spiritual attributes of the universal energy which is partially manifested in this world of sense perception.

Religion has nothing to fear from science, rather it has much to gain. Each of these two phases of human activity has its own prerogatives, its own peculiar field of endeavor. Neither should trespass upon the precincts which pertain solely to the other. But there is also a wide area of middle ground in which the two overlap. There, nothing short of whole-hearted cooperation will permit a satisfactory solution of the problems.

For example, the question of the relative motions of earth and sun is a purely scientific one. It has absolutely no bearing upon religion. Similarly, if we want to know whether man is a product of age-long processes of evolution, or was specially and instantaneously created by divine fiat, or was manufactured from mud in a Jehovan work-shop, we turn to science rather than to religion for information. Such questions can be answered only by the appeal to facts which are within the domain of science. On the other hand, if we want to know which is better, the remarkable organizations of the social insects such as bees and ants, or the most completely civilized type of human society, we must turn to religion. Science may describe the two, but only religion can evaluate them. Only the theologian can suggest which is the more adequate expression of the moral qualities of Universal Energy; that is, which is more in harmony with the highest purposes of God.

There is no excuse for conflicts between the teachers of religion and of science, if each will recognize his own field and respect the intellectual prerogatives of others. There is, however, the zone of overlap between science and religion in which investiga-

tors must combine abilities and techniques. In this zone, we may expect sharp differences of opinion, for it is only in the dust of controversy that falsehood may be eradicated. There should, however, be no warfare where cooperation is so essential. For example, both scientist and theologian must consider love. It is a force with which man must reckon whenever he investigates the activities of higher organisms. In part, the transformations of matter and energy, which love engenders, are measurable. Nobody knows today whether or not all of its consequences can ever be reduced to points on a scale or beats of a pendulum, that is to time and space relations. Certainly, existing technique is wholly inadequate so to relate many of the facts pertaining to love. Pending the attainment of the ultimate scientific technique in such fields as this, there will be disagreement as to the area in which descriptions and interpretations of facts and experiences should be made. We cannot now tell whether such descriptions should be scientific, because quantitatively relatable to time and space, or religious, because essentially non-measurable in nature.

Moreover, there will always be an inescapable need for cooperation between scientist and theologian. History indicates that with the advance of scientific knowledge many facts and experiences which long ago were beyond the pale of scientific description can now be described in quantitative terms. It might be assumed for sake of argument that eventually every reality in the universe will thus become measurable. When one considers the nature of such realities as beauty, rational thought, the sense of obligation which the healthy individual feels toward something somewhere, he may well doubt the validity of that assumption. Nevertheless, it is either consciously or unconsciously made by every thorough-going mechanist, and it therefore must not be overlooked. If all realities are thus eventually describable in terms of relation to time and space, the entire responsibility for describing the universe would rest within the field of science. Then it would still be the duty of religion to evaluate.

Science conceivably could state all possible kinds of activity available for creatures of the sort which we would then know ourselves to be, dwelling in a world all phases of which would then be known to us. It would remain for religion

to select from the many possible kinds of life, the one type of life which is truest, richest, and most worth while. Taking the best description of the world which the keenest observers could supply, the theologian would indicate the goal toward which man should set his face. And this is part of the expanding task of religion. With each enlargement of the horizon of human knowledge, there are newly described realities which must be evaluated. But today and for some time to come, it is also the duty of theology to aid in extending the boundaries of the known by describing as best it can those realities which cannot yet, or ever, be referred to time and space. The discovery of the laws which govern the reactions occurring when spirit meets with spirit is akin to the discovery of the moral qualities inherent in the Universe.

It is this adventurous attitude of discovery which makes religion a dynamic rather than a static phase of human interest, and thus gains for it an important place in higher education. But one of the consequences of this attitude is often misunderstood. If theology is to advance by using the methods of science, it must be awarded the same consideration and respect which science so generally receives. In geology, for example, the formulation of the Planetesimal Hypothesis to account for the origin of the earth involved the demolition of the long-cherished Laplacian Hypothesis and worked a complete revolution in many aspects of geological thought. This is generally acclaimed as a triumphant achievement in the science of geology, although it was a fatal blow to the geology of the nineteenth century. But the "man in the street" has learned to expect such incidents in the development of an advancing science and therefore hails this as a real victory. On the contrary, when a theologian announces that new concepts of God or of the human soul must replace the long-cherished ideas widely current until recently, the average man is very apt to look upon the theological revolution as a mark of weakness, a defect in religion. He fails to see that religion like science must abandon the old when it proves unsatisfactory, and reach out for new and truer concepts. In consequence he prepares questionnaires for college professors, initiates heresy trials, and in every way tries to stamp out those very elements of religion which alone can make it a vital force in the next century as it has been in the past.

The fact is, that rational habits of mind have produced just as great a change in theological as in scientific concepts during the last few decades. It is not simply that the description of the cosmos has been modified; our ideas concerning cosmic administration have also changed. It may perhaps be true that God is the same, yesterday, today and forever. It is certainly not true that our beliefs about Him have stood the test of time without modification. The deistic Jehovah of ancient Palestine, medieval Europe, and modern Arkansas and Tennessee, cannot be worshipped by the truth-seeking theologian in this age of science. The length of a day is not increased at the request of the leader of a chosen race in order that vengeance may be wrought with spear and sword upon a vanquished people. Floods are not sent to destroy men because of their immoral conduct. Fire and brimstone are not rained down from heaven upon the cities of the plain because not even ten righteous men dwelt therein. Elijah was right when he concluded that God is not in the mighty wind, the great earthquake or the terrible fire. Such phenomena which characterize inanimate nature are quite automatic; they have no relation to the moral qualities of human life. Like the rain, they fall alike upon the just and unjust. They indicate only the consistent operation of the energy which is the driving power of a rational universe. They do not reveal the moral quality of the Administration of the Cosmos.

They suggest, however, the method that must be used by the seeker after a rational theistic theology. Something has determined and continues to determine the functioning of natural law, the orderly transformations of matter and energy. The nature of that determining power can be discovered only by observing its effects, the things it has done in the past and is now doing. To the man of science, all the world is now miraculous. Everything he sees is both wonderful and significant, a revelation of the nature of the Cosmic Administration, a means of insight into the character of the driving power of the universe. Much that occurs has no moral significance, but that does not justify the conclusion that moral qualities are entirely absent and the universe is an automatic mechanism. Ethical values appear the moment we scrutinize the organic world. The assumption that animals should be held accountable for their own actions seems

to be justified by the entire experience of mankind. Vital energy is presumably just as law-abiding as gravitation, but these two manifestations of the motive powers of the universe are in wholly separate categories. The laws which determine the activity of living cells are on an entirely different plane from those which determine the structure of inert crystals. It is in the study of life and its development that the moral qualities of the universe are revealed.

From the historical point of view which the geologist naturally adopts, it is at once apparent that the sum total of the forces of nature have in the immediate past been distinctly in favor of humankind. Man is doubtless a product of the interaction of energy and matter in this particular quarter of the universe. If it is "good" for him to be here, then necessarily God is "good." It cannot be an accident that man, with his particular and peculiar powers—mental, moral and spiritual, as well as physical—should occupy his present position among living creatures. Among the forces of nature there must be those which have tended toward an enlarging expression of psychical, aesthetic, and spiritual qualities. If such qualities appear in a law-abiding world, they must be attributes of the Administration of that world.

Reasoning thus, from effects to causes, religion profits greatly from the contributions which science makes to the sum of human knowledge. Even modern psychology is the friend rather than the enemy of theology. The behaviorist is a student of human habits rather than of human nature. For habits are only a part of life. Doubtless, most of our thoughts and actions are habitual, the predictable responses which we make, because of our inheritance and our environment, to the stimuli imposed upon us by the external world. Apparently, our glands and their secretions, the disease germs, and the blows and buffets which condition us, all have a directing influence upon our personalities as well as our bodies. Quite likely, a few surgeons or anatomists, by taking thought together and by skillful use of knife or gland extract, can add a cubit to the stature of many an individual or remodel completely the personality of a moron. Still it is true that within limits the individual is the master of himself. When he sets himself to the task, he can break even a habit of long standing.

When he wants to do so, he can make up his own mind. The behaviorist is merely defining the limits within which man is free. The psychologist is providing man with the information which he needs in order to expand the territory in which he may govern himself.

All such information is needed in the religious task of transforming human nature. For that is indeed the obligation of religion. Were it true that human nature is fixed and determined by forces outside of our control, then religion would be merely a question of hopes and prayers, rather than of faith and deeds. But the perspective of the past and the panorama of the present which science permits us to see, give us a completely satisfactory basis for the expectation that radical changes in the nature of humankind are not only probable but also inevitable. This indeed is the characteristic of all organisms and distinguishes the living from the non-living. In the past, the progressive development of living creatures has been due to the internal response which individuals here and there have made to the external stimulus of local environments. The Administration provided the raw materials, supplied the necessary energy, whispered a suggestion as to possible methods, opened the doors of opportunity and then left it to the individual to decide whether or not to venture through them.

So it is today with man. Science gives him the tools with which to carve his destiny; religion guides him in his selection of the highest ideals and encourages him to attempt the accomplishment of things which have never yet been accomplished in the known world. This of course is the reason why we have institutions of higher learning, and this guarantees to both science and religion appropriate positions of importance in our educational system.

Religion, like science, flourishes best in an atmosphere of eager inquiry and well-intentioned controversy. If all my colleagues in the department of geology at Harvard believed exactly as I do concerning every detail of geological science, most of us would be quite ready to close up the shop and declare an indefinitely continuous vacation. The zest, if not also the purpose of our work, would be gone. The same is true in theology. The teacher specifically responsible for the religious instruction

of the students in college and university should not expect any special favors from his colleagues. If his faith is real and his philosophy sound, he need fear no criticism nor opposition. There is no harm in having an atheist or two on any college faculty, provided he is honest and fair in his dealings with all concerned. His presence will in fact be a real stimulus to creative thinking on the part of his colleagues as well as his students. The student will encounter atheism sooner or later in his experience beyond the college walls. Probably it is better for him to meet it in the favorable environment of the scholastic world where he may quickly discover that much of modern atheism is not really atheism at all, but merely a reaction to the outworn deism of past generations.

If college students are worthy of the expenditures which we are making in the field of higher education, they may be trusted to detect dogmatism whether it be in science or religion. Their wits will be sharpened by the inter-play of ideas; their ideals will be brightened by the comparative study of divergent goals; their hearts will be encouraged by the knowledge that they are junior partners in the firm of "God and Man," an association that is embarked upon the difficult and perplexing task of remodelling a world.

But if, even in religion, we still see only as through a glass darkly, where shall the inquiring student find a lamp to guide him on his way? If all the world is now miraculous, every incident significant of the character of the driving power within the universe, how shall he select from the multitude of events those which reveal the highest purposes of God, the divine qualities of the Administration? For the Christian, the answer is clear; for the Christian has assumed that the life of Jesus of Nazareth displays most accurately of all known lives the finest qualities which pertain to the cosmos, the very character of God. Therefore, he asks the scientist to describe the event which he is trying to appraise, and to interpret it as completely as possible in terms of cause and effect. Then he asks himself the question, Does this event, when rightly interpreted and scientifically understood, tend to induce or enlarge in men those qualities which Jesus so clearly displayed in his own life. If so, the event has for the Christian a religious value; if not, it is not an index to the moral qualities of our world.

This question concerning religious value is not always easy of answer. Sometimes, it is only by the consensus of opinion of many well educated individuals that even an approximate answer can be obtained. Therefore, all the more need for the sort of training which a Christian college should give to young men and women; all the greater demand for conference between men of good intentions but divergent opinions.

The assumption that the life of Jesus is the standard by which the religious value of all transformations of matter and energy should be appraised is an assumption that cannot be proved true by any process of logic known to man. It is an assumption which may be justified only by the universally approved method of science: try it and see. When religion summons the students of colleges and universities to that greatest of all experiments it uses the most powerful inducement within its control. No one who has faith in his fellowmen can doubt what the response will be.

Dr. Charles W. Gilkey, The University of Chicago

When I was spending a summer in the Highlands of Scotland some years ago, I heard a story about Lord Balfour, of which I am reminded this afternoon. Mr. Balfour, as he was then, was playing golf with a caddy who had no idea who his distinguished patron was. Finding his ball in a difficult lie, Mr. Balfour asked the caddy what club he should use. The caddy looked the ball over with his most professional air and gave his advice, which Mr. Balfour took with the best of results. The ball arched to the green and dropped within easy putting distance of the hole. Mr. Balfour turned with a smile to the caddy and said, "Well, that certainly was good advice." "Yes," said the caddy, "and if one of us, sir, only had my brains and your strength, what a golfer he would be."

Our subject this afternoon is likewise one that calls for a combination of wisdom, experience and conviction that is given to few men. The discussion this afternoon has already suggested that the educator, the scientist, and the religious worker must pool their contribution if we are to discover together the place of religion in higher education.

My own approach to this very large question is not primarily that of the educator, certainly not that of the scientist. It is determined by my own immediate background of personal experience. After eighteen years as minister of a city church under the shadow of a great university, I now find myself a full-time official of that university, studying the actual situation in its religious life, trying to find out in which direction it is moving and how it may be most usefully helped forward. I shall speak, therefore, chiefly of matters practical, that have to do with religion as an actual going concern in our colleges and universities at the present time.

Of course the most obvious fact that any observer senses is that religion in the colleges and universities is in process of very rapid flux. That transition on its intellectual and theological side has been vividly set before us this afternoon. President Burton used to say to us at the University of Chicago that no previous generation in human history has had to adjust its religious thought and life to so many new facts in so brief a space of time, as our own. You may remember Professor Wieman's vivid statement of this aspect of the matter: That, whereas, previously the relation of religion to contemporary thought has been like an ice-bridge across a frozen river, over which there may have to be changes in the footpath here or there to avoid new difficulties, the contemporary situation that religion faces is something like a spring freshet where the ice has all gone out of the river and a new bridge has to be built between religion and modern thinking. Of that we are all actually aware, especially after the two addresses this afternoon; and I shall take for granted what has been so well said on the intellectual and theological aspects of our problem. But I should like to point out also that the rapid changes in our contemporary religious situation are not limited to religious thinking.

I am increasingly impressed with certain changes, less conspicuous but perhaps not less significant, that are going on within the religious life of our colleges and universities on other than its intellectual side. Take for instance the religious consequences of that significant fact with which everyone in this room is familiar, that the students in our American colleges at the present time come from more of the different strata of our population

and represent a larger cross-section of our national life, than has ever been the case before in human history.

The religious consequences of that fact are important. We all know that Harvard and Yale were founded to train men for the Christian ministry, and we are all aware that this original purpose no longer dominates their educational policy or characterizes their religious life today. The student constituency of these and of many other institutions has altogether altered in its religious complexion, and consequently in the religious problems which it presents.

One remembers the origin and history of Dartmouth and the prominence in it of religious and commissionary motives, and compares this recent remark from a Dartmouth professor: "We have been investigating the reasons that brought our present student body to Dartmouth, and find with striking frequency the idea that they have come because they understand that Dartmouth is a college where thinking and speech are free. We have a surprisingly small number of ministers' sons here at Dartmouth, and comparatively few of our students come from church-going families."

The question of compulsory college chapel has been much to the front on many campuses of late. I wonder whether part of its difficulty and complexity do not come from the fact that while chapel has remained compulsory, the student constituency that has been compelled to go to chapel has largely changed, and much of it is now utterly unused to going to a religious service at all.

The complications are deeper than those of habitual church attendance. In my time as an undergraduate twenty-five years ago, they used to tell on my own Alma Mater the story of an examination there in English literature in which the question was asked: What are the epistles? One well-educated undergraduate replied that the epistles were the wives of the apostles. Another question was: What are the instances in the Bible when animals are said to have spoken? This priceless answer came in: "One was when the serpent spoke to Eve, the other when the whale said to Jonah, 'Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.'"

That was a familiar type of undergraduate ignorance as to the Biblical data and sources of religion twenty-five years ago.

But recently a college officer told me that when he sat down with an undergraduate who came to discuss religion with him, the student had never heard of the story of the Prodigal Son! Professor Kittredge dismissed a large class at Harvard in Shakespeare a few years ago, because when he asked one student about a reference to Calvary, the undergraduate didn't have the least idea what it was about; and Professor Kittredge said that he would not lecture to a class in which there was any man of whom that was true. We are plainly dealing in our colleges with a larger proportion than ever of students who come to us from homes and backgrounds utterly devoid of religious training, religious interest, religious participation.

We have had, at the University of Chicago, within recent months, another striking illustration of this transitional character of the present situation. Three years ago ground was broken for a great chapel in which donors and planners had assumed that some services at least would be compulsory. Its scale was obviously closely related to that assumption. When the building was about half up the President appointed a commission to study questions concerning its program, and the first step that this commission recommended was that compulsory chapel be abolished. Within the period of the chapel's construction, the situation it was designed to meet had radically changed.

One general agreement about the state of religion in American colleges and universities today is the opinion so strongly reflected in the Princeton conference last year, that it is thoroughly unsatisfactory. No one is happy about it. What to do about it and how to help it forward is a still more difficult and complicated question. But our very sense of that difficulty recalls a story about William H. Baldwin, Junior, when he was president of the Long Island Railroad and had a large part in the construction of the first tunnels under the Hudson River and the East River into New York City. As he and a neighbor were crossing on a ferry boat just before the completion of the tunnels, this latter said, "Mr. Baldwin, won't it be fine to live in New York when these tunnels are all done, and we can go to business without getting out of the train?" "Yes," said Mr. Baldwin, "I suppose it will; but I, for my part, would far rather live in New York now and have my share in the making of the tunnels."

There are, however, these tendencies in the religious situation in our colleges just now which seem to be very significant. You may perhaps feel, as I speak of them, that I am looking at some very faint streaks in the east rather than at the masses of cloud that largely conceal them. It may be that I am too eagerly in search for a few green shoots, and not sufficiently aware of the dead leaves that are heaped upon them. But at any rate, if there is a brighter day ahead, these faint streaks are signs of its coming; and if there is to be greater spiritual fruitfulness in our higher education, these may prove the first outgrowths of the seeds that will ultimately produce it. Whether these things are as significant as I personally believe they may well prove, it is for you to judge; but at any rate I shall call your attention to them and to the evidence for them, and leave you to appraise it.

The first is the resumption of a more active religious responsibility and initiative by American colleges and universities themselves. It is unfair to say that during a generation which, as President Burton said, has had to make more adjustment in its religious thinking, than any previous generation in human history, the American colleges and universities that were from the beginning religious foundations have considered themselves as doing their full duty by their religious responsibility and heritage simply by the maintenance of certain conventional religious traditions which they have loyally kept up.

As one studies the actual religious situation on our campuses one is struck by the fact that our official and institutional religion has so largely consisted in maintaining unchanged some old tradition of daily or Sunday chapel that was inherited from a bygone day, and saying then to our constituency and to the world, "This is the evidence that we are still religious." To whom has the difficult task been chiefly left of relating not only the thinking but the living of students who were caught in the contemporary whirlpools of religious thought and practice? It has been largely left to Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. secretaries; to student pastors just off the campus; to representatives of the churches; while institutions that were religiously founded have seemed to feel that in days like these they were doing their full religious duty by requiring their students to come to a traditional chapel service.

It may be that the anomaly of such a situation could only be corrected by some sharp break between this old tradition of compulsory chapel and the actual situation such as has come to pass on so many of our campuses within the last few years through a strike or a controversy. It may be that the only way in which we could break through to some recovery of initiative and leadership on the part of the institutions themselves was by more or less revolutionary methods. At any rate, it is plain that presidents, administrative officials, faculties and boards of trustees are facing with a new seriousness and a new sense of urgency, the question: What is this institution's responsibility for religion?

No one can review the discussion at Harvard as to whether or not there should be a new chapel, and the way in which the administration there has answered it; no one can consider the striking fact that within the last two years, Princeton, Yale, Dartmouth, Northwestern and Chicago have radically reorganized their official habits of religious life and work, and in each case on the initiative of the institution itself; no one can recall the fact that the recent conference at Hanover of the full-time religious officials in the Eastern colleges was called by the invitation and the hospitality of Dartmouth College itself; no one can talk as I have recently talked with one of our leading college presidents who said, "Do come in and shut the door, and tell me what you are going to do in Chicago, for the religious situation here calls for much more attention than I have time to give it, and yet something must be done about it. Can you tell me what to do?"—without realizing that our colleges and universities themselves are at last showing signs of resuming a religious initiative and responsibility that only they can discharge.

A second significant fact is that in our college and university religion we are at last making earnest with one of the clearest realizations of the last few years about the nature of religion itself: namely, that religion is not simply or even chiefly a set of opinions, a formulated creed, a theory or a proposition about the universe; religion is an active interrelationship between the individual and his total environment and is intimately related therefore to the growing situation in the midst of which he lives.

It is again an anomalous fact that the main lines of organization of the religious life in the American colleges and universities have in general been determined by conditions not inside these institutions but outside them. Such organizations as the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A., and our denominational churches have carried religion to our campuses out of circumstances and problems very different from those of the campus itself, and have laid the rails on which the going religion of most campuses has run for a generation at least.

Meanwhile, the idealism that is native and "indigenous" in our American higher education has found its forms of religious expression largely determined for it by influences not nearly so "indigenous." If you have read Professor H. N. Wieman's searching book on *The Wrestle of Religion with Truth,* you will remember with what relentlessness he draws the conclusion that if America puts all its religious education into Sundays as sacred, and all its other education into the week-days as secular, and then lays its main stress on the secular side, the student will come out from the total process with an inevitable sense of unreality about what he has got on Sunday in the Sunday school and in the church, and with the natural assumption that the secular interests are the really important ones. So must it prove also with religious training on the campus.

If one's growing life as a student, in class room and laboratory, in athletics and college activities, runs in one channel determined by the campus life itself, and if certain denominational or organizational channels unrelated to that campus life are the main sources of its religion, there is certain to be an increasing sense of unreality about the latter. Not until we recover some deeper and more inclusive unity in the educational process itself, that shall relate religion more closely to the growing enterprises of student life itself, and organize it in terms of those growing interests, shall we recover that sense of the reality of religion for the student. A group of undergraduates at the University of Chicago were recently discussing the better orientation of its religious life, and one of them blurted out: "Why do we always have to meet separately as men over here and women over there when we want to do something about religion, when here at the

University of Chicago three-quarters of our life is in common, and yet when it comes to religion we are separated?''

That is a hard question to answer, and it cuts very deep. I suspect that in the future it may prove a question with which we may have to deal more fundamentally than we have yet realized; that we must find some way of relating our growing religious life to the actualities of student life in an articulation much closer than any yet achieved. Is this one reason, perhaps, why so many conferences on the cooperation of religious agencies among students so often have such a sense of unreality? We meet from the start under denominational or organizational auspices that are not the normal realities of the campus. They may be the normal realities of the town or of the city, but they are not the student's realities: at least, they are not in the foreground of his consciousness.

However, it is just here that I see more than a streak of light in the eastern sky. I find students themselves insisting more than ever on gearing their religion to their growing life, on getting together as men and women to discuss the common problems of the institution even though they be organized separately as Y. W. C. A. and Y. M. C. A.; and most of all I find them getting together with the faculty.

One frequent false dilemma for religion in American universities has been the assumption that has left religion to the ''voluntary'' initiative of the students alone, while undergraduates and faculty have gone their way on different sides of the same street. Dean Sperry tells us that one of the great surprises of each year at Harvard comes during the week when daily chapel is conducted by faculty men; many students then discover for the first time that professors whose reputation they know full well, have religious attitudes and convictions of which they had never previously known anything.

That is a frequent happening, in our larger universities particularly. It suggests that until we find some fuller cooperation between faculty and students in terms of the actual realities of campus life, we shall not be very far on the way to the solution of our problem. This of course cuts rather deep. It means that it is of little use to say that an educational institution

believes in religion if its more vital contacts with its students show no sign of religious motives or religious standards. How much can a dean of religion accomplish on a campus if the vocational, athletic, and other official advisers of the students have no religious interest or approach whatever to the problems with which they deal?

A third streak of light on the eastern sky is the significant fact that so many institutions are now setting apart, some of them for full time and some of them for part time, men of proved capacity and adequate training for religious leadership, to study and further the total religious life of the institution. At Princeton, Yale, Dartmouth, Williams, Amherst, Wesleyan, Northwestern, and Chicago, such men have been called to their present full-time positions within the last few years, all of them from significant positions in religious life and work outside. It has been reported when the trustees of Oberlin College approached Dean Wilkins with regard to the possibility of his taking their presidency, one of them said to him, "If you should come to Oberlin you would be the first president in our history without special training and experience as a religious leader; and because we value our religious tradition at Oberlin, we should like to know what your own religious policy would be."

One suspects that President Wilkins's reply was prophetic: "My own theory is that one reason why religion languishes on the American college campus is because we have so long taken it for granted that some sadly over-loaded president who was once a minister, or some very much over-worked professor who was once a theological student, can look out for the interests of religion and guarantee the religious atmosphere in a college; when as a matter of fact he has been much too busy to give real time to its problems or real leadership to its religious life. The first thing I should hope to do would be to try to find the best man in the country to come and give his whole time to the active leadership of religion at Oberlin."

One suspects that his analysis went deep, and that the recent widespread turning to full-time or at the very least to part-time leadership that shall have enough background, enough training, enough leisure, and enough energy to give to the real and press-

ing problems of religion on the campus, is a late resumption by the American college and university of an active religious leadership which they can hardly get along without.

I should not wish this to be understood as implying that such leadership must always take full time. I am only persuaded that when someone gives part time to it, he must have enough time to be able to do some justice to the situation, and not find himself so overloaded with administrative or other responsibilities that his leadership is merely nominal. I should like, in passing, to call attention to the fact that the institutions just named have all set enough store by their new position to give it an official rating in every respect commensurate with what most of us here this afternoon would probably call its importance.

I should like finally to say that if the three leads to which I have called attention are in any sense significant leads, they point toward these conclusions. First, religion in the colleges these days is a great adventure. We shall get ahead by methods of trial and error. We shall fail time and again, and in the process discover better ways. As President Eliot used to say of democracy in our cities, "Let us experiment, and not despair."

In the second place, religion in the colleges is likely to find for itself new institutional forms of expression. Why not? American life has already given us what now calls itself the community church, undenominational, different from the heritage of the past, and organized around the going life of the neighborhood. The college is a neighborhood in itself, with characteristics and backgrounds, experiences and interests that peculiarly qualify it to be fertile soil for religious progress; a matrix in which a new orientation of religion may yet be developed, that shall be undenominational, uncreedal, honest, daring, adventurous and yet faithful.

I am convinced, finally, that college religion very largely comes down, as the phrase of one of the speakers this afternoon has already suggested, to a question of atmosphere. Professor John M. Coulter used to tell us at Chicago that when you put a tree into a vacuum furnace in order to separate its permanent from its perishable elements, that which happens to the tree is not at all what we who are laymen in botany would expect to be the

case. We should have taken it for granted that the real and enduring tree would have been made up out of the elements which the tree secures from its roots, from the solid earth out of which it has so obviously grown. "Not at all," says the botanist, with a smile for our ignorance, and the remark that here again things are not what they seem. Those roots are indeed indispensable to the health and growth of the tree. Cut them off or clog them up, and the tree will wither and die. But in the test of the vacuum furnace, that which endures as pure carbon is what the tree has absorbed through its leaves, from the invisible atmosphere around and above it; whose contribution was so imperceptible that nobody paid much attention to this particular part of the tree's environment, until in the final crucible it proves that the carbon that alone endures this ultimate test is what came from that same atmosphere.

It is all a parable of the educational process also—especially of the influences with which we are concerned this afternoon. Out of the invisibles and imponderables of personal relationships and of institutional life, come the influences that endure longest and count for most.

President E. P. Robertson, Wesley College, Grand Forks, N. D., has announced the gift of $40,000, a contribution from John M. Hancock, of New York City, who graduated from the University of North Dakota in 1903. The money is to be used to assist in providing an additional building, including necessary equipment and furnishings, costing $100,000. The donor requested that the building be known as "Robertson Hall," writing —"We would like to have your name linked in a material way with Wesley College, the University of North Dakota and the State of North Dakota itself. We know you have been a unifying influence among the students of past years—regardless of denomination—and so we are hopeful that this new building unit will further the cause of religious idealism among the increasing student bodies of years ahead."

The gift was made jointly by the Hancock family, Mrs. Hancock being a native of Grand Forks, a daughter a recent graduate, and a son a student at the present time in the university.

UNIVERSITY NOTES

HERBERT E. EVANS

The Eastern Regional Conference of the Conference of Church Workers in Universities and Colleges was held at Briarcliff Lodge from January 29 to January 31 inclusive, with an attendance of about seventy people. The attendance was marked by the wide denominational distribution of the group and the enthusiasm for the Conference program. Requests were made that much of the Conference material be published in CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, which will be done during the year. The first of these articles will be found in this issue—an address by Dr. M. Willard Lampe, University Secretary of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. and Director of the School of Religion at the State University of Iowa.

An interesting seminar concerning relations of Roman Catholics, Jews, and Protestants was held at Earl Hall, Columbia University, on January 30 and 31, under the auspices of the National Conference of Jews and Christians. Addresses were made by Father J. Elliot Ross, Rabbi Isaac Landman, and President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University. Three round tables conferred for two sessions, covering:

(1) *Vocational adjustment*—which dealt with the difficulty the Jews, Catholics, and Protestants have in fitting themselves for positions, and the problems employers face.

(2) *Misrepresentations of religious beliefs and practices*, dealing with the ways religious beliefs and practices of Jews, Catholics, and Protestants are misrepresented, and what measures might be used to prevent such misrepresentations and promote understanding.

(3) *Community areas of conflict and cooperation*, covering a study of our political and social antagonisms, and a study of successful ventures in mutual understanding.

The Conference was largely attended by Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, and it was decided that many more such conferences should be held in the future. President Butler's opening address will be printed in the April issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

Suggestions from a University Secretary

Do you see any discussion possibilities in the following quotations:

"It should be obvious that a great fortune cannot be *earned*; it must be, in some way, the fruit of 'privilege.' No one in this country *earns* more than, say, the president of a great university, or a cabinet-minister like Frank B. Kellogg. . . . As an elderly man, our leading citizen will then have $300,000." (This is evidently the top limit for wealth which may be *earned,* according to the author.) Drake, *The New Morality,* p. 195.

"It is also obvious that there is no logical connection between any of these (theological) doctrines and the laws of morality. Whatever be the truth about God, the Universe, or the destiny of the human soul, justice and mercy and loving-kindness are right, selfishness, lust, and hate are wrong." (Drake, p. 254.)

"The strength of conservatism is that it is a substitute for thinking; all that is required is to keep things as they are." (Is this a monopoly of conservatives?) Drake, p. 325.

"As a teacher, I am surprised to find that nearly all the brighter students have given up the belief in immortality—and that before they have taken courses in psychology and philosophy." (I should be glad if you would send me the results of your experience on this subject.) Sellars, *Religion Coming of Age,* p. 182.

* * * * *

After reading Drake's new book (see "The Worker's Bookshelf"), I jotted down these questions and suggestions: Are any standards universal? Are there any "oughts"? Upon what authority can we accept any obligations? Moral nihilism versus moral progress. Are one man's standards as good as another's? To what extent should we do what the Romans do when we are in the holy city? Is it true that human beings are more alike than unlike, and, if so, how does this affect the question of standards? Is hedonism a tenable philosophy? Is the way to be happy to be moral? Is morality that which conduces to self-realization? Why not be selfish? Why and when is self-indulgence wrong? How can we diminish lawlessness? What is wrong with making all the money you can? (I don't promise to send the answers to these questions.)

THE WORLD STUDENTS LIVE IN

M. WILLARD LAMPE

I have been assigned an impossible task. There is no one world that students live in. There are as many worlds as there are students, even more, for one student will live in many worlds in the course of a single season. The curriculum, the campus activities, the pep-meetings, the vacations at home or away from home are all different worlds.

The best I can hope to do is to describe the median world of the average student although, of course, the average student does not exist. Every student possesses both the sins and the idiosyncracies to keep him from being average. As religious workers, let us understand at the start that we cannot do our job by working on the students *en masse*. It calls for case study, individual diagnosis, and specific prescription. Nevertheless, we cannot keep from generalizing, and it is profitable so to do, if we remember what we are doing, and do not forget the inevitable margin between all generalizations and the reality we are trying to describe.

I will attempt to pick out only those elements of the world students live in which are of help in defining the task of the religious worker. Conceivably, all the elements might be of value, but we will pass them by if they are of practical significance only to cooks, managers of cigar stores and soda fountains, haberdashers, beauty parlor operators, barbers, etc. On the other hand, we recognize that the world students live in, as seen by many professions other than ours, such as movie-managers, house mothers, registrars, and the police force might be of practical interest to us also. We will try to keep this in mind.

I. The world that students live in is an *artificial* world. Its essential framework is abnormal; at least it is unlike any segment of society to which we could properly apply the term "normal." In some respects it is like a monastery, in other respects like a cabaret, neither of which can claim much sociological support as wholesome patterns for the human race. It is fundamentally artificial because the normal family relationships are lacking.

The home is our best social norm. Here the incentives and safeguards of human conduct, individual freedom, and social obligation are usually found in their best form and balance. To be sure, the time comes when breaking away from home is normal and desirable, but the world of students is not only cut off from home life, but from the broader relationships of community life as well. The play of children, the infirmities of age, the cares and responsibilities, the successes and misfortunes of those who are doing the work of the world are all more or less remote. Even wholesome contacts with those of one's own age are not always easy. I recall one senior who told me that during his four years he had not had the opportunity of conversing once with a decent girl. Of course, it was his fault, but he lived in a world where that was possible. The conditions under which students eat and sleep are not essentially different from the situation of thousands of others in these days of lunch counters, bachelor hotels, etc., but they are artificial just the same—indeed, far more artificial than in the case of other young men and women because of the economic factor. A degree of normality is always maintained when one has to work for his living. Students presumably work, but not for a livelihood except in part and in a limited number of cases. They are supported by charity, and frequently far beyond their real needs. It is therefore economically an artificial world. Without doubt, these underlying artificial conditions are accountable in large part for the excesses of college athletics and social life. Excesses easily thrive when economic necessity and home influence are removed. The world in which students live is very human, but it is not normal in its social fabric.

II. The world in which students live is a *comfortable* world. This point might be mentioned as an additional illustration of the artificial character of the students' world, but I think it is important enough to merit a place of its own. While one may find many instances of real hardship and sacrificial living, the great majority of students have plenty to eat and to wear, and lead very protected lives. They do not have to get up early and do the chores in the face of wintry blasts. They do not have to put on their overcoats while they are studying in winter, or spend

their time swatting flies and mosquitoes in summer. The dormitories and fraternities are fashioned more and more after first-class clubs, in their ornate design and upholstered equipment. Indeed, excessive comfort and luxury stalk across the campus in many forms. While tin lizzies are still the style, the best models of cars are not hard to find, and even gents' furnishing shops do a thriving business in the sale of silk underwear. Soda fountains and smoke shops are well patronized day and night. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent in many a university in the course of a single year for elaborate house-parties, formal hops, and other forms of soft entertainment. Moreover, when students get sick there are usually infirmaries, doctors, and nurses near at hand to provide the best treatment and care. Then, vacations come fairly frequently with opportunities for easy relaxation. Of course, there is another side to the picture: a few athletes endure hard training and do exploits; many students live economically and work their way both during school term and vacations, but, all in all, there is a great deal of soft comfort and luxurious underpinning in the world in which students live. If a student does not become pudgy-minded and chicken-hearted, it is not because there ar not many appropriate factors in his environment to make him so.

III. The world in which students live is a *parochial* world. A university may, and frequently does, through its various schools and departments of study and research, cover practically the whole area of human knowledge and culture. That is to say, it may be a university in reality as well as in name from the point of view of its intellectual and even utilitarian range. It may provide training for all the vocations from the cook in the kitchen to the captain of industry. Furthermore, it may assemble on its campus representative students from every state in the union and from every nation and race under heaven. But the average student, like the average professor, comes into effective contact with only a very small portion of these total offerings. He slips into his little niche and stays there. He is a "dent," or a chemist, or a journalist, or a commerce student, and even if he is in the College of Liberal Arts he majors in a certain department. Research is "the nervous system of the university" and this is al-

ways a narrowing process. It breeds specialists. Of course, this is a part of the glory of the university, but the price thereof is a parochial mind. This is truer of graduate students than undergraduates, and it is truer of some graduates and undergraduates than others, but it is certainly fair to say that students live in an intellectually segmented world, where each segment is more conscious of its own importance than of the importance of the whole, where broadening and unifying tendencies are weak while narrowing and specializing tendencies are strong. It is a rare professor who can fairly appraise the relative worth of his own department. Students can do this better, but they seldom have the equipment for the task.

However, there is a more serious side to this question. The parochial limitations in the fields of intellectual pursuits are usually matched by a like or even greater parochialism on the social and human side. There are dental fraternities for dental students, Jewish fraternities for Jewish students, blue-blooded fraternities for the aristocrats and the gentry, and even outside of fraternities and all other groups which are constitutionally exclusive, the actual associations of students are usually determined by their likes and prejudices, and not by their intellectual needs or social deficiencies. It is the exceptional student who really gets acquainted with a student of another race or land. It is probably correct to say that the great majority of students have just as many prejudices on their graduation day as when they matriculated, and these prejudices are more pronounced, for usually a senior is not so humble as a freshman. The average student really believes that his race, his nation, his state, his university, his fraternity, his particular department of the university are, measured by any reasonable standards, as good as there are. He has received a parochial training and he possesses a parochial mind.

IV. The world in which students live is a *pragmatic* world, perhaps one should say a *conventionally* pragmatic world. I do not want to give the impression that the quality I now have in mind is an altogether reprehensible thing. On the contrary, it has its very fine side. Pragmatism is the great American virtue. Of course, I cannot use the word in this connection in its strict

sense of referring to the philosophy of James, Dewey and others, for it would certainly be misleading to describe American students as living in a world of carefully defined philosophical concepts. I use it rather in the loose and popular sense of referring to the appraisal of all values in terms of immediate utility, quick results, and obvious success. This has a good side, but a very bad one too. A student once said to me, following the session of a religious discussion group, "I instinctively feel whenever I stand in the presence of a rich man that I am standing in the presence of a great man." A rich man is one who has arrived somewhere. The question of the road he took, or what happened on the way, makes little difference. He came through, and would that I might do likewise.

One phase of this pragmatic world is the emphasis upon the vocational idea. Prominent among the reasons for attending college or university is the desire to earn a good livelihood. Those parts of the curriculum which contribute to this are important; those which do not are of little consequence. This of itself is sufficient to introduce a spirit of externalism and superficiality into even the most serious activity a student engages in. I once found an engineering student committing to memory some formulae of use in bridge-building. I asked him, "How was this particular formula derived?" He said, "O, I don't know; all I have to do is to memorize it so that I can use it." That might be all right for engineering formulae, but what if they were moral formulae—the Ten Commandments, for example? If a student knows them by rote, but does not know how they were derived, he will not be able to build very strong moral bridges either for himself or for others. Students are acquiring a great mass of useful knowledge without acquiring an adequate critique for measuring either the validity, the relative worth, or the highest utility of that knowledge. If it gets results, and gets them in a hurry—that is sufficient. "Make it snappy" is the crack of the whip to which students respond. The philosophical dictum, "The how determines the what," is not among the ruling ideas of the undergraduate world.

Moreover, this pragmatic spirit appears not only in the vocational emphasis of the curriculum, but even more in extra-cur-

ricular affairs. Here we get into the world of "activities" which is the apotheosis of practical and obvious achievement. Success in an "activity," unlike success in a laboratory, is always easily demonstrable. It usually requires no prolonged study, no patient experimentation, no process of trial and error, but it is an office to which one is elected, an affair which one manages, a contest in which one participates—something to which we can point with satisfaction and pride in the next issue of the *Varsity News*. The spirit of all this is seen most easily in college athletics—especially football. It is not at all difficult to recognize a successful coach, a successful team, or a successful season. All are successful if between September 15 and November 30 the home team has made a greater number of points than its opponents in every game, or in all but one or two, although even the loss of a game or two is a serious blotch upon the record. It makes little difference to what extent the breaks of the game determined the outcome, although a disinterested spectator would say that the majority of games are won or lost through these breaks—it makes little difference what the comparative yardage gained from scrimmage was, or the relative number of completed forward passes, it makes no difference how green the team was at the start of the season in comparison with its skill at the finish, it makes little difference how free the team was from all scandal or unsportsmanlike conduct, it makes little difference what spirit it showed in defeat, everything was success or failure according to one infallible criterion,—the scoreboard. This is the pragmatic spirit in its most virulent form, and the essence of it pervades the whole world in which students live. Some one has said that the key to the understanding of student activities is "the sporting philosophy of life," the philosophy which regards everything as a game to be won or lost, the rules of the game being determined by rigid student tradition. There is much to be said for this viewpoint, and it is the reason why I suggested that the world in which students live is a *conventionally* pragmatic world, for while students may be bolshevists in revolting against the code of their elders, they are czarists in maintaining their own. What is the students' own code of success? There are three very clearly defined elements in it. To be successful one must belong to a fraternity or soror-

ity, must have standing in some activity, and must make a passing grade in his studies. How real and compelling this code is may easily be seen in the bitter disappointment of those who do not make a fraternity or sorority, in the political maneuvering for the capture of offices, and in the sophisticated content with *simply* a passing grade. Students want to achieve—that is one of the most glorious things about them. Many of them have high ideals of achievement. For the mass, however, achievement is conceived to consist of rather quick and standardized results. At any rate, they all live in a pragmatic world.

V. The world in which students live is a *sex-conscious* world. The mere mention of this factor without any elaboration might seem to be sufficient, but we had better pause long enough to reflect upon its relative importance among the other factors we are considering. There is no factor more regnant than this, and none about which we can more safely generalize. We religious workers all get high-brow and abstract from time to time, but we never get farther away from reality than when we suppose that students may get so wrapped up in their studies or in athletics or in religion as to forget sex. Every student faces this question, and his solution of it goes a long way in determining the tone of his life. Artemus Ward once asked this question, "What is the best way of getting a mule into a pasture where you want him?" and he answered it by saying, "Put him in an adjoining pasture and let him jump over the fence." Students will never get into the pasture of the most vital religion except as they vault into it from the field of sex. They are living at the mating time of life and the biological urge is a big part of their world. Let us not feel disconsolate, therefore, when we bring to the campus a world's authority on some phase of religion and suffer the chagrin of being able to get only a handful of students to hear him, while we have no difficulty in packing the house for a second-rater who is advertised to speak on "The Choice of a Wife."

However much the decline of prudery and the frankness with which sex matters are discussed today may have lessened or increased the tensions in the sex consciousness of students (doubtless both processes have been going on), we may be sure that the sex impulse is accountable for many of the finest and for many

of the worst things in university life. All of the excesses of campus life are related to it either directly or indirectly. In a questionnaire conducted among the graduating seniors of a large state university last spring, drinking was named as the most destructive influence which these seniors had noted in their university course. It was mentioned nearly twice as frequently as any other evil. How are we to explain the prevalence of drinking among students? Of course, there is no single explanation, but there is good reason to believe that an outstanding cause is the desire to increase the sex stimulus. This is certainly true in the case of the hip flask at the dance.

On the other hand, why are Young People's Societies, made up of men and women, usually a more popular part of the religious program than the separate Bible classes for men and women? A large part of the answer is this factor of sex consciousness.

We will never understand the world in which students live unless we assign high importance to this factor. The success they achieve in their studies, the clarity with which they approach the fundamental questions of religion, and the wholesomeness of their whole attitude toward life are determined more than we are apt to think by this element in their world.

VI. The world in which students live is a *religiously wistful* world. This is the best term I can think of to describe the real religious experience of the majority of students. Of course, one will find much apparent indifference to religious matters, much doubt and denial of accepted religious tenets, and also much positive religious belief, but the underlying and prevalent mood seems to be a wistful longing for a satisfactory philosophy of life and a tenable religious faith. To be sure, this is just what one should expect in view of all the factors in the situation. The great majority of students come from religious homes, are indeed members of the church. However, in their university courses they catch a spirit which casts suspicion upon the viewpoints they have held from earliest years. Sometimes this spirit is blatant, at other times very modest and even sympathetic, but the result is bewilderment and not a little poignant searching of heart. To be sure, most of these questionings go on underneath the surface. Students shy away from all easy advice on re-

ligious matters, especially from professional counselors unless they have exceptional graces of sympathy and understanding. In the questionnaire among graduating seniors above referred to, the question was asked, "To whom would you go for help on religious problems?" and the answers showed that students would go to parents or to other students before they would go to pastors, although they would go to these before they would go to professors. Moreover, students are too busy with other things to permit their religious perplexities to come to the surface very frequently. Some do, of course, but the mass can easily submerge vital religious problems in light-hearted talk or never-ending activity. Nevertheless, this element of religious wistfulness is never far away and it manifests itself in a great variety of ways—in bull sessions, in editorials, in the sure response of students to a vital religious message, even in church attendance. The following statement in a recent report of the Student Division of the Y. M. C. A. impresses me as being a fair generalization: "Students are approaching religion through their minds and feelings, but not through their will. The attractive words are 'interpretation,' 'explanation,' 'self-realization,' 'unity'; but not 'duty,' 'obedience,' 'conscience,' 'sacrifice,' or the 'will of God.'" This is only another way of describing what I mean by a religiously wistful world. Students are suspicious of many of the conventional forms of religious life and belief, and they reveal a great deal of selfishness and of unwillingness to pay the price of an intelligent faith, but they know there must be something in religion and they would like to find out what it is. Among the combustible materials with which religion usually lights its fires, there may be found in student life today a dissatisfaction with the present religious status, a predisposition in favor of the hope that religion can mean something that vitally helps life, and a certain number of professors and students who have already found the way. It is a religiously wistful world.

I must remind you again as I draw to a close, that I have been dealing in generalizations, and it is quite possible that a person might live near a campus for some time and not find any of these generalizations true. He might find a considerable number of students of whom you could assert that they live in almost the

exact opposite kind of a world from the kind I have been describing. Indeed, in almost every paragraph I have been conscious of the existence of individual students who belied my words at the very moment I was writing them. A composite picture never looks like anybody.

However, I am sure that these generalizations are sufficiently accurate to suggest some of the elements which should enter into the task of a religious worker among students. In an artificial world he should be *in loco parentis,* bringing the naturalness and warmth of home ideals and relationships to bear upon the situation, and doing this through his own home, through the homes of other people, and through the friendly contacts of a home-like church. In a comfortable world he should challenge students to live adventurously, even dangerously, setting an example in his own life through self-imposed discipline and the personal promotion of ideal causes. In a parochial world he should seek the broadest contacts and culture, and should provide definite opportunities and projects for a better understanding and sympathy between the various human groups and types to be found on the campus. In a pragmatic world he should write into the dictionary a new definition of success—one which goes beyond quick results and conventional standards, and takes into account character-values and human service. In a sex-conscious world he should baptize all his work with the spirit of romance, finding beauty and worth wherever he goes and in every one he sees, and by precept and example associating a tender regard for others with the very joy of living. And, finally, in a religiously wistful world he should be able to give a reason for the hope that is in him, and make both available and attractive the necessary conditions for the development of a reasonable and robust faith. The university pastor who doeth these things shall never want to be moved.

The ninth annual Ohio State Educational Conference will be held at Columbus, April 4, 5 and 6. Dr. Arthur J. Klein, Professor Joseph Jastrow, President E. H. Lindley, Dean John W. Withers, as well as many well-known public school men will participate in the program.

DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS, EDITED BY ISMAR J. PERITZ, PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

THE RELATION OF THE BIBLE TO COURSES IN HISTORY*

MAUDE LOUISE STRAYER, The Masters School

One of my moments of greatest satisfaction is that in which a student at last grasps the idea that Palestine is part of a *real* world, the Jewish people as real in History as were the Egyptians and that the narratives of the Bible relate not to isolated events in a dim and shadowy past but to definite happenings in the history of the Ancient World. In other words she is correlating her Bible and her History! I try to accomplish this early in her Bible career by starting my College Preparatory Bible course with reference reading on the Ancient World—Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia and a map study of migrations and locations of its ancient peoples. With wall maps constantly before us and often map problems in the assignments, we go on through the year discovering the relationship of the little Hebrew nation with each succeeding world power—or neighbor nation—Egypt, Philistia, Syria, Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, Greece, Rome. We find that Bible is thus definitely related to *History* in the matter of the *contents*. Girls who have had Ancient History the year before bring to the Bible class much background of general information and understanding. While for others, our class is the pioneer into the mystery of that unknown past where they first learn of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, Alexander and Pompey; of Egyptian building enterprises, "Cedars of Lebanon," Phoenician sailors and Tyrian gods; of Roman legions and Greek culture. Just how much pioneering we do and how necessary it is, is well illustrated by an answer I received on a written paper: "Hellenism is an ancient Greek religion based on the legend of Helen of Troy"!

*A paper read before the National Association of Biblical Instructors, New York, December 28, 1928.

But our Bible study is as much related to history in its *methods* as in its contents. One of the chief reasons why I begged this Association several years ago to do something about preparing a syllabus for a College Entrance Bible Course was because I had before my envious eyes a syllabus used by the History Department for its College Preparatory Course in ancient history. This clarity of outline and definiteness of content and purpose, I knew we needed in our Bible study planning. In our *assignment* methods we follow those of the History Department, grouping the material under *periods* and apportioning the year's time between them. For example, under each period's assignment would come: 1. Bible material; 2. Textbook assignment; 3. Supplementary reference reading; 4. Map problems; 5. Any special topics; 6. The number of conferences or recitations and the topics for discussion for each particular conference. Here I have included two very closely related historical "methods":—

(1) Reference reading: Where a student supplements her textbook with another or several other authors of various opinions and consequently is forced to formulate her own conclusion, and

(2) Map work. I give much more map assignment than that required in our syllabus. I may require too much but I find that for the girl who gets her information largely through her eyes, map pictures tell more of a story than a printed page and having created them herself, she can remember their story better. Put up the maps a girl has done in chronological order on the bulletin board and you have a graphic story of the history of the Hebrew people from early migration to the world of Paul's day.

Another contribution from the historical method is *outlining*. It is very interesting to me to watch the development along this line as we progress through our two years of College Bible Preparatory course: the way the class note books improve in appearance, clarity of thought and system and ability to distinguish the important from the detail shown in the outlining of material. The girls fairly clamor for charts—summarizing a given topic as Paul's Journeys—or an outline in graphic form of the Divided Kingdom showing relationship of Judah and Israel in one column and foreign relationships in another—and so on. This makes it most imperative for the teacher to have *a very clear* outline herself ready for each discussion hour.

Much of all this is reciprocal. When my girls go to their history, they bring to it all their Bible training in sifting evidence, subordinating detail to important event, tracing cause and effect, taking notes and outlining clearly as well as a certain amount of content. Our history teacher told me that she always tells her girls to take every question possible on the Hebrews in their College Boards for those they'll surely know. To my chagrin the charm was broken last spring when one of my ex-students did not recognize Solomon in all his glory. My only consolation—as far as the Bible Department was concerned—was that she failed the rest of her *history!*

I asked my senior group if they thought Bible stood as an isolated subject in their school career or was there any correlation between it and their other subjects. They were most emphatic that it was not isolated. Several of them offered to write out their ideas for me. I hope you will be interested as I was with some of their replies: *History*—"because the Bible itself is a history of the Ancient World." "Bible is the greatest help in history. I found I knew all the Hebrew history for Ancient from Bible." *English*—"Our Bible papers give us a chance to apply what we've learned of clear, concise writing." "Being one of, if not the greatest of literary achievements, its perfection of composition is an excellent example to which to refer in our English class."

> *Science.*—Even in the small amount of science which we learn in the physics and chemistry classes we can get a feeling that as all the universe is so magnificently constructed there must be something back of it. In Bible class, the rather muddled idea which we have of God begins to be clarified.

Psychology. They related the idea of native and acquired traits and characteristics to a discussion of *Sin and Changed Lives,* and of the psychology of leadership to the leadership of Jesus. *Studio.* Charts and graphic maps. *History of Art.* "For to appreciate ancient architecture and medieval art a knowledge of religion is necessary—especially Christianity—to get all the spirit of the Middle Ages."

But of all the correlation they mentioned or of which I have thought, that which most delights me is *not* the correlation of Bible and *ancient* history but of Bible and *modern history*. In the oldest group, made up of some general course seniors and some college girls having already passed their College Entrance Bible, we look out at the world of need around us, studying the problems of war, industrial relationships, child labor—then go on to see if in the teaching of Jesus Christ we can find any principles which will help solve such problems. And here we come to the heart of it all; the most modern, the most pressing problem of all. Does Bible relate to the lives our students have to live? That this may be so is the biggest dream we of the Bible Department at Dobbs have and so it is with greatest joy that I can go on quoting—as follows: "A study of the Bible makes that book seem a part of you and not something vague and written long ago"; from another:

> When I hear the Bible read or read it myself *now,* I get something out of it instead of just meaningless words. I enjoy some parts which I have come into contact with often, whereas before practically all Bible reading was a task. If I had not started being interested in Christian history and modern problems here at school, it might have taken a long time for me to be interested in these things and in sermons, serious books, work, etc., in connection with them. But I think and hope now that I will be interested in them always.

Another:

> In "Tens" (our school Sunday evening discussion groups led by the girls themselves) I often use topics that we have talked about in Bible. In fact, I couldn't get along without them. . . . However, the most important benefit of Bible is not in the way it applies to our lessons but to our actions and our relationships with girls at school.

Another:

> The Bible classes lay a foundation for personal religion. They classify and show necessity of using the Bible. This study will not only affect our lives when we leave school but it seems to me that girls here at Dobbs *think* more of religion, and what is *more vital,* attempt to put their knowledge and

high ideals into everyday life. . . . Not entirely due to Bible classes but they are quite as essential as Sunday night hymns to our ideal Dobbs life.

And in conclusion:

Without the Bible classes I think that much of the religious side of Dobbs would seem meaningless and superfluous—but in the classes, unless obstinately decided not to learn about religion, one can't fail to get an understanding of it all. I think the Bible classes are in a large part responsible for the sincere and deep religious feeling to be found among many of the older girls of Dobbs.

Have not these girls shown us all what they most want from our classes? And in meeting their deepest religious need, are we not reaching the greatest correlation of all—the Bible and life?

A conference of College Religious Workers was held at Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., March 7–10. The theme was "Character Education." All Negro colleges were invited to send delegates—two from each institution, college presidents, college pastors or chaplains or teachers of religion. A registration fee of $2.00 covered necessary expenses, and entertainment to officially designated delegates was provided free by the university. Much interest was manifested and the stimulating program will certainly yield permanent fruit.

* * * * *

Dr. Hamilton Holt, President of Rollins College, said in his address before the Presbyterian College Union at Chattanooga that he could remember only two things taught him during his college course. One was the definition of dialysis and the other the definition of a term that he could not mention in Tennessee. This, he says, was the definition given by Herbert Spencer of this banned subject as "a change from an incoherent, indefinite homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity through continuous integration and differentiation."

THE RELATION OF ARCHAEOLOGY TO THE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE*

Professor Lewis Bayles Paton, Hartford Theological Seminary

Biblical scholarship depends, directly or indirectly, to a greater or to a less degree, upon many other branches of learning. Astronomy, chemistry, physics, geology, geography, botany, zoology, anthropology, ethnology, comparative literature, psychology, philosophy, history of religion, and comparative religion are all important for the correct interpretation and evaluation of Hebrew literature. It would be hard to find a science which is not ancillary in some measure to Biblical research.

While, however, all these disciplines are useful to the Biblical scholar, they are not so indispensable as are the two sciences of philology and history. A thorough knowledge of the languages of Scripture is necessary for the solution of all the problems of Biblical criticism. History also is fundamental for the interpretation of the Bible. Exegesis is primarily a problem of lexicography, grammar, and syntax; but it is more than this: it is a determination of the specific meaning of any given passage in the light of the circumstances under which it was written. Ever since the Protestant Reformation it has been recognized that the grammatico-historical method is the only valid method of Biblical interpretation.

Archaeology is a subdivision of history. It differs from general history merely in the fact that its records have not come down by literary transmission in manuscripts or books, but are obtained through exploration or excavation. These records may consist of inscriptions, which do not differ materially from manuscripts, or they may be non-literary products.

In Old Testament study archaeology occupies a fundamental position because of the lack of other historical records, Hebrew or foreign, that are contemporary with the Old Testament.

* Read before the National Association of Biblical Instructors, New York, December 29, 1928. In one institution the Biblical Department is using the syllabus as a class outline. Reprints may be obtained from the Council office for 25 cents.

I. Archaeology gives an exact chronology of the ancient Orient.

The Babylonian List of Kings, published by Pinches in 1884, contains the names of the kings of Babylon and the years of their reigns from Sumu-abu, the first king of the First Dynasty, down to the fall of Babylon. This list overlaps the Canon of the Alexandrian astronomer Ptolemy from Nabonassar onward; and by combining the two documents, we obtain 2225 B. C. as the date of Sumu-abu's accession. This date is confirmed by astronomical observations recorded in the reign of Hammurabi, the sixth king of the First Dynasty.

The Assyrian Eponym Canon, discovered by George Smith at Nineveh in 1875, overlaps both the Babylonian List and the Ptolemaic Canon. Its accuracy and the accuracy of the other lists are brilliantly confirmed by its record of a total eclipse in the year 763 B. C. It gives us the precise dates of the kings of Assyria back to 889 B. C. For the centuries before this date the recent German excavations at Asshur have disclosed the names of all the early kings of Assyria, and have furnished us with synchronisms with the kings of Babylon which make it possible to work out an approximately correct Assyrian chronology back to 2000 B. C.

Within the last few years lists have been discovered of twenty dynasties of Sumer and Akkad, before the First Dynasty of Babylon, with the lengths of the kings' reigns, so that the approximate dates of these rulers have been determined back to 3000 B. C.

In Egypt recorded astronomical observations make it possible to fix the dates of the Pharaohs with considerable precision from the Twelfth Dynasty onward. These results are confirmed by the Tell el-Amarna letters, which show that Amenhotep IV, king of Egypt, was contemporary with Burnaburiash, king of Babylon, and Ashuruballit, king of Assyria. For the Old Empire the results are less certain, but we have reasonably correct figures from 3000 B. C. onward.

Archaeology, accordingly, has given us a complete and accurate chronological framework for the history of the ancient Orient.

II. Archaeology gives us the main outlines of ancient Oriental history.

1. *The Eolithic Period* lasted for unknown ages before, let us say roughly, 500,000 B. C.

2. *The Paleolithic Period* extended from about 500,000 B. C. to 10,000 B. C.

3. *The Neolithic Period* lasted from about 10,000 B. C. to 5000 B. C.

The history of these first three pre-literary periods has little relation to the Old Testament, except for its bearing on the Hebrew stories of the origin and early civilization of mankind.

4. *The Sumerian Period.*—The Age of Bronze began in Western Asia about 5000 B. C., and lasted down to 1200 B. C. Its first period was the Sumerian (5000 to 3500 B. C.). About 5000 B. C. a race appeared in Babylonia that we call Sumerian from Sumer, the ancient name of South Babylonia. They invented the cuneiform writing, and developed an extensive literature, much of which is now known to us. This literature shows that the cosmogony and astronomy of the later Hebrews, their traditions of the creation, Garden of Eden, fall, antediluvian patriarchs, and flood, their types of religious poetry, and the fundamental principles of their social and religious legislation, all originated among the ancient Sumerians.

Contemporary with the Sumerian period in Babylonia was the pre-dynastic period in Egypt, in which hieroglyphic writing was invented and the type of Egyptian civilization was fixed.

5. *The Akkadian Period* (3500 B. C. to 2500 B. C.).—As early as 3500 B. C. a Semitic people, speaking a language closely akin to Hebrew and Aramaic, pushed out of Arabia into Akkad, or North Babylonia, and gradually dispossessed or absorbed the older Sumerian population. The inscriptions of the kings of this period found at Nippur and Telloh reveal the astonishing fact that Palestine was ruled by Akkadian monarchs between 3500 and 2500 B. C., and that active trade was kept up between Babylonia and Syria all through this period.

Contemporary with the Akkadian period in Babylonia was the Old Kingdom (dynasties I–VI) in Egypt. The kings of this period were the pyramid-builders, and worked the copper-mines

at the traditional Sinai, where they have left numerous inscriptions. Under Pepi I of the VI dynasty a certain Uni inscribed on his tomb a record of his campaign in Palestine. This is the earliest document that we possess for the history of pre-Israelite Canaan. The archaeological remains discovered at Gezer show that during this period Palestine still remained on the Neolithic stage of culture.

6. *The Amorite Period* (2500 B. C. to 2200 B. C.).—About 2500 B. C. the Amorites, a second wave of Semitic migration, overflowed Babylonia, Palestine and Egypt. In Babylonia they put new dynasties on the thrones of Ur, Nisin, and Larsa. In Egypt they overthrew the Old Kingdom and caused a period of anarchy from the VIIth to the Xth dynasty. Amorite remains are found in Palestine just above the caves of their Neolithic predecessors. The excavation of numerous mounds has given us a clear picture of the civilization and the religion of the people who were on the ground when Israel entered Canaan.

7. *The period of the First and the Second Dynasties of Babylon* (2200 B. C. to 1760 B. C.).—About 2223 B. C. Sumu-abu founded the Amorite First Dynasty of Babylon. The sixth king of this dynasty, the famous Ammu-rapi, or Hammu-rabi, by many identified with Amraphel of Genesis 14, united all Babylonia under his rule, and extended his conquests as far as the shores of the Mediterranean. His law-code in 282 sections was discovered by De Morgan at Susa. It contains many striking parallels to the legislation of the Old Testament. Under the kings of the First and of the Second Dynasty Palestine was a Babylonian province, and was penetrated by Babylonian civilization. Cuneiform became the script of the country, and lasted down to the writing of the Tell el-Amarna letters about 1400 B. C. The Babylonian elements in the religion of the Old Testament are probably due to the fact that during this period these elements were absorbed by the Palestinian Amorites from their Babylonian kinsmen, and by them were passed on to the Hebrews after the latter had conquered Canaan.

In Egypt, contemporaneously with the First Dynasty of Babylon, arose the brilliant Middle Kingdom of dynasties XI–XII. From this period comes the tale of Sinuhe's travels in Palestine,

also the "Tale of the Eloquent Peasant," and the "Admonitions of Ipuwer," which show remarkable resemblances to the Hebrew Wisdom Literature.

8. *The Kassite-Hyksos Period* (1760 B. C. to 1580 B. C.).—About 1760 B. C. the Kassites appeared in Babylonia, overthrew the Amorite dynasty, and founded the third, or Kassite dynasty. Contemporaneous was the invasion of Egypt by the Hyksos, or "Shepherd Kings," which brought the Middle Kingdom to an end, and caused another dark age, like that which intervened between the Old Kingdom and the Middle Kingdom, The mounds of Palestine reveal a similar catastrophic ending of Middle Bronze culture in that country.

9. *The Period of the XVIIIth Dynasty in Egypt* (1500 B. C. to 1350 B. C.).—Under Ahmose, the founder of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, the Hyksos were expelled, and Egypt began a career of conquest in Palestine and Syria which lasted for over three hundred years to the end of the nineteenth dynasty. During this period the great Aramaean migration, to which the forefathers of Israel belonged, poured out of Arabia and overflowed Babylonia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, and Canaan. From this period we have the copious historical inscriptions of the Pharaohs of the XVIIIth dynasty, and also the famous Tell el-Amarna letters. These are some 350 diplomatic dispatches, written in Babylonian cuneiform, from Syrian and Palestinian rulers to the Egyptian kings Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV (c. 1400 B. C.). These letters speak of the Habiru, or Hebrews, as menacing Canaan, and give a marvelously complete picture of that land before the Hebrew conquest.

10. *The Period of the XIXth Dynasty in Egypt* (1350 B. C. to 1200 B. C.).—The XVIIIth dynasty ended ingloriously on account of civil strife in Egypt, caused by the attempted religious reformation of Akhenaton, or Amenhotep IV. The Asiatic provinces were lost, and remained in the hands of the Habiru and the Hittites. Order was at last restored in Egypt by Harmhab, the founder of the XIXth dynasty, and under his successors, Seti I and Rameses II, Canaan was reconquered. From these kings we have numerous historical inscriptions. The Hittite records, written in Babylonian characters, have also been de-

ciphered, and yield much additional information in regard to the history of this period. The recently discovered inscription of Ahi-ram of Gebal dates from about 1250 B. C. and is the oldest alphabetic inscription yet discovered in Palestine. The Stele of Merenptah (1225–1215 B. C.) contains the first and only mention of Israel found as yet in the Egyptian records, and indicates that some Israelites at least were settled in Canaan as early as the reign of Merenptah. The excavations in Palestine have yielded a very complete picture of the civilization of that country during this period of Egyptian rule.

11. *The Hebrew Period* (1200–1000 B. C.).—This was the period of the decline of Babylon under dynasties IV–VIII, and of the decline of Egypt under dynasties XX–XXII, but of the rise of Assyria to the position of leading power in Western Asia. About 1200 B. C. Canaan was invaded simultaneously by the Philistines from the West and by the Israelites under Joshua from the East. The Philistines first brought iron into Canaan. They were responsible also for the introduction of Late Minoan art. The Hebrew remains show that the conquerors adopted and debased the civilization of their predecessors, and they confirm the statements of the Old Testament that Israel served the *ba'alim* and the *'ashtaroth*. From this period we have numerous traditions, but no written Hebrew records as yet.

12. *Period of the Hebrew Monarchy* (1000–885 B. C.).—About 1000 B. C. Jerusalem was captured by David, and was made the capital of the Hebrew monarchy. Recent excavations on the eastern hill of Jerusalem have revealed the walls and the gates of the City of David.

13. *The Assyrian Period* (885 B. C. to 626 B. C.).—From Ashurnasirpal III (885 B. C.) down to the fall of Ninevah in 612 B. C. the annals of the Assyrian kings furnish us with a precise history of the period year by year, and picture the irresistible advance of Assyria, until her empire extended from India to Ethiopia. In this period begin the earliest Hebrew inscriptions, the Gezer Inscription, the Mesha Inscription, the Siloam Inscription, and the ostraca from the palace of Ahab. The earliest written records also begin. First come the Judean documents and the Ephraimite documents that have been used in the composition of

our older historical books of the Old Testament. They are followed by the writings of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, the four prophets of the Assyrian period.

14. *The New Babylonian Period* (626 B. C. to 539 B. C.).—In 626 B. C. Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, threw off the yoke of Assyria, and in 612 Nineveh fell. Nebuchadrezzer, the son of Nabopolassar, conquered all the provinces of the extinct Assyrian empire. These two kings have left extensive inscriptions, but unfortunately not arranged in chronological order like the Assyrian annals. The inscriptions of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, have an important bearing on the historical character of the Book of Daniel.

15. *The Persian Period* (539 B. C. to 333 B. C.).—In this period we have the inscriptions of Cyrus, Darius, and the other Achemenian kings. Here also the testimony of Herodotus and other classical historians first begins to be valuable. The most important archaeological find of this period is the records of a Jewish colony at Elephantine in Egypt.

16. *The Greek Period* (333 B. C. to 60 B. C.).

17. *The Roman Period* (60 B. C. to 350 A. D.).

In these two periods written historical records are abundant, and archaeology becomes of less importance for the interpretation of the Bible; still archaeology has done much for New Testament criticism. Fragments of the New Testament have been found that are older than any existing complete manuscripts, and these are valuable for textual criticism. The papyri and ostraca from Egypt have thrown new light upon the language of the New Testament, by showing that it was the colloquial Greek, spoken throughout the Roman Empire, at the beginning of the Christian era. These documents also reveal the social life and the thought of the lower and middle classes in which Christianity first spread, and thus aid in the interpretation of the New Testament. The types of literature found in the papyri also help us to understand the literary forms of the New Testament. The logia and the fragments of lost gospels that have been discovered preserve perhaps some authentic sayings of Jesus that are not found in the canonical gospels, and at least throw light upon the process by which these gospels were produced.

In fixing the chronology of the New Testament, archaeology has done special service. It has established the fact that the Roman census occurred every fourteen years, and that one census was taken in 20 A. D. The second census of Quirinius fell, accordingly, in 6 A. D., and the first census of Quirinius, at which time Jesus was born, fell in 8 B. C., unless perhaps, as Ramsay thinks, the census was delayed in Judea. An inscription from Delphi that mentions the proconsul Gallio proves that Gallio arrived in Corinth not later than 51 A. D., and thus fixes the chronology of the ministry of Paul.

Finally, archaeology yields much information in regard to the popular religions and the mystery religions of the Roman Empire in the midst of which Christianity spread, and by which it was profoundly influenced.

From this rapid survey it appears that, in the course of the last quarter-century, archaeology has succeeded in reconstructing the history of the ancient Orient from the earliest times down to the beginning of the Christian era.

III. Archaeology makes possible a historical arrangement of the Biblical material.

The traditional method of study, which has lasted in many quarters down to the present time, assumes that all the records in the narrative books of the Old Testament are strictly historical, and that they are arranged in chronological order. Accordingly, it constructs a so-called "Biblical History," derived exclusively from the Scriptures; and proceeds to illuminate and to "confirm" this with materials derived from archaeology. The aim of this method is not scientific but apologetic. It does not seek to ascertain the whole truth in the light of all known facts, but to defend a dogmatic theory in regard to the historical character of the Bible.

Both of the presuppositions on which the traditional method rests are untenable. The Biblical records are not equally historical, and the arrangement of the material in the narrative books is not always chronological. The first eleven chapters of Genesis are not history but mythology, derived ultimately from Babylonia. The theory of the compilers of the Hexateuch, that the tribes of Israel were united politically and religiously in all the

experiences of the sojourn in Egypt, the wandering in the desert, and the conquest of Canaan, is contrary to the testimony both of archaeology and of the earliest Hebrew sources. The documents of the Hexateuch frequently contradict one another, and therefore cannot be equally trustworthy. Their statements are often in conflict with the facts of archaeology. The Book of Chronicles is unreliable in comparison with Samuel and Kings. Daniel and Esther are shown by archaeology to be quite unhistorical.

The Hexateuch is full of historical facts, but it is destitute of any real chronological arrangement. It is a conglomerate of traditions of every period from the Sumerian down to the times when the writers of the documents lived. The stories of the patriarchs are partly traditions derived from Israel's Amorite predecessors, partly genuine memories of the Aramaean forefathers, and partly experiences of the nation after the conquest of Canaan. The stories of the "sons of Israel" are partly memories of the wanderings of the tribes before they entered Canaan, and partly episodes of the conquest. Archaeology and the earliest Biblical sources show that Israel entered Canaan in two divisions, and that these migrations were two hundred years apart; but this fact has been obliterated in the present form of Hexateuchal tradition. The Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings for the most part are arranged chronologically; but they frequently depart from the chronological order. The canonical arrangement of the Prophets is entirely un-chronological, both in the order of the books, and in the order of the sermons contained in these books. The arrangement of the books of the Old Testament in the Hebrew Canon as a whole is equally un-chronological.

In view of these facts it is clear that "Biblical History," in the sense of history derived solely from the Bible, is impossible. Accordingly, instead of positing the Bible story, and trying to fit into it the facts of archaeology, we should reverse the process: we should posit the outline of history given us by archaeology, and try to fit into it the facts of the Bible. Archaeology discloses some seventeen clearly defined periods of history before the beginning of the Christian era, and gives us a record of the main events in each of these periods. These periods are the pigeonholes into which we must file away the scattered frag-

ments of history preserved in the Old Testament. With the help of the historical framework furnished by archaeology it is possible to bring order out of the confusion of the Old Testament; and to write a history, which will not be "Biblical" in the technical sense, but which will be a history of the ancient Orient, in which all the information furnished by the Bible will be utilized in its appropriate place.

I plead, accordingly, for a radical change in our method of teaching the Bible in colleges and seminaries. Not to start with the Old Testament, and to attempt to adjust to it the discoveries of archaeology, but to start with a thorough knowledge of the history of the ancient Orient, given by archaeology, and to fit into this sure framework the scattered and frequently obscure data found in the Old Testament.

The Association of Teachers of Religion (Mid-West Branch of the National Association of Biblical Instructors) will meet in Des Moines, Iowa, in connection with the Religious Education Convention, April 3–5. The Association of Teachers of Religion is cooperating with the Religious Education Association in preparing the program for the two sessions of the Convention which deal with the college and university, on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning. Further information may be obtained from Professor Hedley S. Dimock, of the Young Men's Christian Association College, 5415 Drexel Avenue, Chicago, Ill., or Professor J. F. Balzer, of Carleton College.

* * * * *

The second annual conference on Christian Education dealing with "The Mutual Relations of the College and Its Constituency" was held at Otterbein College, February 5 and 6. The President and other members of the Board of Trustees, as well as members of the Faculty, participated with prominent church leaders in a thoroughly considered and constructive program. There was an excellent attendance and much enthusiasm. The college was host to regular delegates and speakers.

REPORT OF THE COLLEGE COMMITTEE*

President E. E. Rall, North Central College, *Chairman*

This is a committee whose field and possibilities are great, but whose labors in recent years have been slight.

(1) Two years ago the Committee proposed a statement of policy with respect to the college field for the Council. An effort was made to point out the fundamental, if not primary, place of the church college in the program of our Boards of Education, and consequently the fundamental place the same should occupy in the work of the Council. This was referred to the Executive Committee.

(2) Last year a tentative blank for uniform college reports was presented and the committee was authorized to continue its work and formulate if possible a satisfactory blank upon which there might be general agreement.

(3) With reference to this last item, such a blank is herewith presented.** The chairman has given this matter considerable study and believes that the general adoption of some such blank would be of great value both to the Boards and to the colleges concerned. It must be confessed, however, that, although a number of authorities were consulted and commented favorably, no effort was made to secure specific approval of the same by any of the constituent Boards. It is the opinion of the Committee that the blank should be called to the attention of the proper official in each Board and an effort made to secure joint consideration and approval for general use of this or some other uniform blank.

(4) With respect to *policy*, the Committee believes:

a. It is still necessary to carry on a campaign of education for the church college. The church college is under fire as never before, and its reason for being is coming to be questioned more and more. The needs of the colleges financially continues to be as pressing as heretofore.

* Presented to the Council of Church Boards of Education, January 7, 1929, Eighteenth Annual Meeting, Chattanooga, Tenn.

** To be printed in a later issue of Christian Education. It is now being revised by a joint committee of the Council and Association of American Colleges.

b. There is much hope for the church college in the present experimentation, especially in the fields of teaching methods, curriculum and organization. Such efforts should have sympathetic study, criticism, and evaluation. Plans found successful and worth while should be given publicity.

c. There is need to continue the efforts to make the so-called Christian college genuinely Christian in its life and teaching. This involves better coordination and cooperation among the various agencies at work in the field of the religious and social life of stuednts, continued improvement of the instruction in Bible and religion; more attention to the religious implications of all parts of the curriculum; and more attention to character and religious influence in the selection of the teaching and administrative staffs.

CONFERENCE ON FINANCIAL AND FIDUCIARY MATTERS

The Third Conference on Financial and Fiduciary Matters will be held in Hotel Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J., Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, March 19–21, 1929. The conference will deal with subjects such as the following: Why Do People give Permanent Funds to Charity?, Channels through which Personal Interest Expresses Itself, Discrimination as to Appropriate Instruments, How Far Can Wisdom See?, The Principle of Posthumous Discretion, Should Charitable Endowments be Perpetual?, The Technique of Cooperation, Guarantees of Integrity and Honesty, Trends in Legislation as Affecting Funds for Charity, Economic Changes as Affecting Investment of Charitable Funds.

Specialists in these several fields will speak and time will be allowed for free discussion. An enrolment fee of $5.00 will be charged. Persons desiring programs may apply for them and may register with the Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters, 105 East 22d Street, New York City.

This invitation to attend is extended treasurers, financial secretaries and others responsible for and interested in handling of endowments and trust funds. The Committee reserves the right to limit membership in the conference to 150 people.—*A. W. A.*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR STUDY OF THE CHURCH PROGRAM IN THE NORMAL SCHOOL COMMUNITIES*

Katharine C. Foster, Chairman

In presenting this, the third report of the Committee studying the Church Program in the Normal School Communities, we wish to show the extent to which the church boards have recognized their responsibility for the religious and social welfare of the students who through the state normal schools and teachers' colleges are preparing to teach; and by quoting from the reports received from the denominational representatives connected with such institutions, to give an idea of the nature and scope of the work which has been undertaken.

The Committee of three have been assisted and have had their own resources and experiences strengthened this past year by the active cooperation of representatives of four additional denominations. The constituent boards of the Council were asked to give the names of their representatives who were working in normal schools and in teachers' colleges. From these reports, as far as we have been able to ascertain, there are only nine church board representatives who are working directly with the students of such institutions in the entire country.

There are 183** state normal schools and colleges of education according to the latest published report of the Commissioner of Education, June 30, 1928, with a student enrolment of 252,907 (17,209 additional in private institutions). The same report shows an enrolment of 280,437 in publicly controlled and supported institutions of college or university grade; and 486,704 in private institutions of the same rank. In the normal schools there are nearly as many students as in the state universities and colleges, and more than half as many as in all of the denominational and privately controlled colleges and universities. This means that approximately one-fourth of those enrolled in insti-

* Presented to the Council of Church Boards of Education, January 8, 1929, Eighteenth Annual Meeting, Chattanooga, Tenn.

** Omitting Hawaii, Philippine Islands and institutions exclusively for colored students.

tutions beyond secondary grade are preparing for the teaching profession. With the exception of the Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian Boards in the South, replies to the Committee's inquiries indicate appropriations made to but three or four centers from any one denominational board, and a very small total, therefore, for the whole United States, as compared with the amounts expended upon work in state universities and in the privately controlled colleges and universities. In contrast to the 127 "student pastors" or secretaries employed for work with teacher training students, the report published by CHRISTIAN EDUCATION indicates 400 such workers in other institutions, and for students preparing largely for occupations other than teaching.

Judging from the statements of executives of the church boards of education, there is a cordial and earnest desire to accomplish more for the normal school students, but for lack of facilities, of financial appropriations, or of time to study the situation thoroughly in recent years, each feels the inadequacy of its existing program. We wish to repeat what has been said before, that there is no other group of students for whom it is of equal importance that the best possible service should be given. These students are to be the teachers of the nation's children, they are to be the molders of lives, and will help create the ideals of the future citizens. Moreover, many of the normal school graduates as they go into the country and village schools, have it within their power to become the social and religious leaders of the neighborhoods in which they teach. From every point of view, then, it is of the greatest importance that the churches and church boards should come to realize the need and the value of a service that they can and should render through the assignment and support of student pastors in the normal schools and colleges of education. If any field has to be neglected or any opportunity limited, this is not the one—it should receive first consideration.

What is the nature of the program and the character of the service that has been offered in these schools in which there are church representatives? Quotations from reports which we have received from those who are serving under the direction of the

Northern boards will afford a picture of what is being done and is fairly representative of work being accomplished in any section of the country, although a far wider and more comprehensive program is now being undertaken by a number of the Southern boards.

The program emphasis, regardless of denominational distinction, seems to be upon the personal need of the students, not upon large group activities. The development of leadership within the local church in such a way that no student will fail to find an understanding reception extended by the church people has been recorded of primary importance. Efforts have also been made to provide for church services which will be productive of spiritual growth for student members who are part of the congregation, as well as to have regard for the needs of the adults who are permanent members of the church. Due to the prevalence of students from smaller communities, the "glamour of the new life" is recognized and in place of prohibitions each student secretary has tried to introduce students to the phases of social life which will tend to develop results in terms of character, as well as in terms of recreation which is satisfying.

The following quotations illustrate the type of opportunity which has been provided and which seems to be most appreciated.

> I use the telephone a great deal to call up students whom I have never met. I ask the student if she can spare me some vacant period the next day, or even ask her to lunch with me alone. Very often I choose a name out of a whole page of names, which are just names to me. It is absolutely uncanny how frequently the interview reveals the student is right in the midst of despondency needing support or encouragement, or in some other way needs just what I am able to give. It is a long slow process, but I still believe in it. I prefer this method of calling, as it gives the student a chance to select the time and it seems less as though I had inflicted myself upon her in the short hours of leisure.

Quoting from another pastor:

> My work has been largely personal. I have been able to arouse a certain amount of confidence in my work by various activities in the community and in my church. I find

that a great many students who do not belong to my church attend it regularly. By this means I become acquainted with them more or less formally, and then, through some of our groups that I entertain in my own home, I come to know them individually and personally. It has been my experience that the real needs of students are met not in large groups, but in singling out and dealing with individuals.

From a third source we quote the following:

> The second phase of the work is taking the students to homes of culture in a body, as many as thirty or forty together in a group. Here they are entertained by a speaker who has something to say about the church or making life worth while. After the events of the evening, they are given a little supper, but the point I make here is to send them to the very best homes where they see culture and Christianity at its best.

Another responsibility assumed by the churches is to provide channels for Christian-citizenship training, which may be reproduced in any community to which the students may go as teachers. Occasional pageants or other dramatic productions take into account the always crowded student schedule, when permanent classes and prolonged committee membership responsibilities are impractical or require large numbers of participants. A "Win My Friend" movement was initiated under skilled direction as part of the evangelistic effort of one local church, in order that each student church member might feel a personal connection with a constructive measure for deciding Christian attitudes.

In the way of service some pastors have encouraged but one event for the year, such as raising money through homemade candy sales to secure a sum for Christmas presents and entertainment for a mission church in the poor districts of the community.

Symbolism and insignia have an appeal, especially for the less mature students. The rector of an Episcopal Church has, for example, secured the seal of old Canterbury, England for the use of members of his student group which had selected the name of "The Canterbury Club."

The time element interferes with the plans of many churches for normal school students, but the experience of some local secretaries shows what may be accomplished.

We schedule nothing for groups of students between Sunday and Friday. The average length of time that a student remains on our campus at one time would probably be less than two years. Every department of the college has its club in which membership is almost obligatory. These and other organizations connected with the college leave almost no leisure time for the students.

The home-going habit seriously impairs continuity in our Sunday programs. However, this only makes the need of wholesome interests greater for those who are too far away to go; and the others, too, when they do stay.

I should say that one of the finest things which we are able to do for our students is to show them that the churches here represented are not working in opposition to each other but desire most of all to have them find their best possible expression through avenues most normal to their present conditions and to those in which they will find themselves as they go out from college.

. . . In fact our whole church membership has a most unique interest in the students who come to us. Add to this the fact that our denomination does not have a large proportion of the students enrolled and you will readily see that we can actually give them a church home. Church people invite them into homes and my own apartment is adjacent to the campus.

Another practical difficulty in the way of serving students in a state educational institution has arisen in the relations of the local churches to faculty and administration. To assume that members of the faculty or other officials will take the initiative for encouraging student participation in the community religious life is often possible. But if the full responsibility is left with them the condition becomes abnormal; for the students suspect an element of official compulsion which becomes immediately distasteful. The church leaders should be able to approach the administration confident of a sympathetic hearing if they first know the social regulations of the college, the calendar for various events, including academic appointments, as well as the results of previous experiments in community demands upon the campus. The worth of patient, constant cultivation of faculty interest is revealed in the following:

We never lack for the very best of faculty leadership in whatever we ask. The administration is increasingly sympa-

thetic. We try to keep our president and dean informed about what we are doing. These contacts are made both through student leaders and by student secretaries with the college people.

I find that I am able to bring my students into a closer contact with faculty members through the church. This serves the double purpose of having the young people come into the company of splendid personalities and also of having them know that these busy professors still have faith in and time for the Church.

Faculty members may be used successfully as leaders in church school classes, in discussion groups, and as fellow workers with students in the "deputation trips" to nearby churches.

A value often overlooked may come to the student in knowing the other fine church members, leaders in the business or professional groups of the town, who have the gift of understanding and influencing young people for wholesome intellectual and spiritual development.

Practical courses for students have been built upon specific problems in their home churches, such as the need for planning Sunday school teachers' meetings that offer training in educational methods, Church Vacation Bible School organization, and program building for young peoples' societies. Demonstration by participation is most convincing, but requires the direction of skilled leaders. Here the special denominational policies have worked in different ways. Some provide actual credit courses, some promise summer positions with small remuneration, and in others the secretary or local pastor can establish connections with church officials through whom the graduates may expect effective introductions to places for service if they wish to avail themselves of the opportunities offered. It would seem superfluous to point to the advantages of introducing state and district denominational officials to the work of local churches with normal school students, but the fact that such acquaintance is infrequent and neglected indicates the need of further effort on the part of both board of education staff and local pastors.

In few other educational institutions are the students so homogeneous. They come most often from a limited geographical area, homes of similar cultural opportunity and from

churches of similar type. These conditions may simplify and unify the possible courses of religious training, but make them no less important.

The Normal School Committee recommends to the Council of Church Boards of Education:

Recommendations

(1) Some systematic provision for an exchange of information indicating methods and policies used by the churches in their work with the students of normal schools and colleges of education.

(2) Preparation of illustrative material in such a way that it may be made available to pastors of local churches who have not had special training for student work, to encourage them in their friendly ministry in the normal school communities.

(3) Continued attention to the importance of providing financial assistance by the Church Boards of Education for the maintenance of effective religious programs in the churches in normal school communities, which may include employment of special student pastors and secretaries where the need for such leadership exists.

Attention is called to the April issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, which will contain a report by Dr. Kelly of a special study made in the Council office on "Faculty-Building," in which the colleges affiliated with the constituent boards of the Council cooperated. This report is one of four papers presented at the joint session of the Association of American Colleges, the Council of Church Boards of Education and church college associations at Chattanooga, Thursday morning, January 10. For the entire group, see the Association of American Colleges *Bulletin* for March, which contains the entire Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Association. This number is one of especial significance, combining what have previously been the first three issues for the year, and will be sold at $2.00 per copy. A special rate, however, is quoted to persons who are affiliated with Association colleges.

The April issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION will also contain President Nicholas Murray Butler's paper to which reference is made in Mr. Evans' "University Notes."

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION*

PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER, Elon College, *Chairman*

For three years now this Committee has been making annual reports to the Council of Church Boards of Education.

In our first report, we suggested a three-fold need for Religious Education in the denominational colleges as follows:

(1) A closer integration between work of denominational Leadership Training and the courses in Religious Education and Bible offered in denominational colleges.

(2) More adequate facilities for laboratory work in Religious Education in denominational colleges.

(3) And a definite linking up of personnel work in denominational colleges with the department having to do with the teaching of Bible and Religious Education, so as to insure a Christian motivation for life.

In our second report we submitted certain findings with reference to the growth of the teaching of Bible and Religious Education in American colleges, and outlined seven approaches to the problem of the organization of a major in Religious Education on the college level.

These approaches were outlined as follows: (1) The Definitional; (2) The Institutional; (3) The Student; (4) The Administrative; (5) The Scientific; (6) The Church; and (7) The Experimental.

By correspondence during the month of February, 1928, the members of the committee were asked to study the organization of a major in Religious Education along these lines dividing up the work as follows: Dr. C. P. Harry, The Definitional approach; Dr. H. O. Pritchard, The Student and Experimental approach; Dr. William S. Bovard, The Administrative approach. Dr. James E. Clarke was requested to pursue the matter from the Church approach, but requested to be excused.

An article explaining these various approaches or techniques was published in the July issue of *Religious Education*, having been previously submitted to the Council of Church Boards at Atlantic City, and rewritten for *Religious Education*.

* Presented to the Council of the Church Boards of Education, January 7, 1929, Eighteenth Annual Meeting, Chattanooga, Tenn.

The Committee has been unable to have a session as such during the past year and the chairman has no way of knowing what his colleagues have found it possible to do in the special assignments allotted them in the investigation. He is only able to speak for his own efforts.

PRACTICE IN INSTITUTIONS OFFERING MAJORS IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Chairman of the Committee has carried forward the study he began and reported on a year ago at Atlantic City, to discover the practice in the institutions of higher learning that offer majors of thirty semester hours or more for undergraduate credit in the field of Religious Education, defined technically as "The Theory and Practice of Teaching Religion."

Fifteen institutions were found offering such majors as follows:

TABLE I

Institution	*Semester Hours Offered*
University of Southern California	46
Northwestern	70
Drake	37.8
Asbury	30
Centenary	36
Millsaps	36
Duke	31
Elon	48
Ohio Wesleyan	43
Denison	40
Wittenberg	41
Phillips	39
Oklahoma Baptist	44
University of Tulsa	37
Cedar Crest	36
Temple University*	—
15 Institutions	614.8 Semester Hours

Average number of semester hours offered in each 40.99.

* Temple University reports in the survey that it offers a major of 31 hours in Religious Education, but it has been impossible to verify this. In the case of some others reporting majors, courses in Psychology and Philosophy or History of Religion listed in other departments were included.

TABLE II

Title of Course	*Number Times Occurring*	*Semester Hours Earned*
Psychology of Religion	14	43
Religions of the World	8	27
Philosophy of Religion	12	29
Leadership Problems	2	5
Principles of Religious Education	13	36
Methods of Teaching	10	26
Psychology of Childhood and Youth	5	14
Socialization of Children	1	3
Adolescence and Character	1	3
Organization and Administration	18	67
Handcraft	1	2
Church Vacation School	1	2
Worship and Hymnology	12	29
Use of the Story	3	4.5
Pageantry and Dramatics	4	8.5
Practice Teaching and Field Work	6	28
Recreational Leadership	4	7
Recent Movements in Religious Education	2	6
Elementary Methods of Teaching	2	5
Curriculum of Religious Education	10	31
Principles of Teaching	1	3
Tests and Measurements	2	5
Secondary Methods	1	3
Principles and Technique of the Survey	1	3
Week-day, Vacation and Teacher Training Schools	2	6
Principles and Technique of Research	1	2
Determinants of Character	1	2
Introduction to Study of Religion	1	3
History and Nature of Religion	2	6
Literature of World's Religions	3	7
Religions of the Ancient World	1	2
Religion of Primitive Peoples	1	2
Religious Teachings of World's Religions	1	3
Ethical Ideals of World's Religions	1	3
Pragmatism and Religion	1	2
Modern Religious Educational Programs	2	4.4
History of Religious Education	9	24
Fine Arts in Religious Education	2	5

Title of Course	*Number Times Occurring*	*Semester Hours Earned*
Problems and Methodology of Religious Education	1	4
Psychology of Adolescence	5	15.4
Adolescent Programs	1	2
Religious Education of Adults	2	5
Religious Education in the Family	3	7
Problems of Philosophy	2	6
Genetic Psychology	1	3
Psychology of Abnormal Mind	1	3
Theory of Religious Education	1	2
Religious Education as Guidance	1	2
Christian Education and the Church	1	3
Christian Education and the World Community	1	3
Projects in Religious Education	2	5
Seminar in Religious Education	2	4
Religious Education and Public Education	1	3
Leadership Training Course	1	6
Life Ideals of Great Thinkers	1	3
Ideals and Values	1	3
Education in Religious Living	1	3
Religious Education of Children	1	2
Religious Education of Adolescents	2	5
Anthropology	1	2
Evolution and Religion	1	3
The Mystics and Mysticism	1	2
The Modern Sunday School	2	5
Problems of Religion	1	3
Expressional Activities	1	3
Moral and Religious Aspects of Education	1	2
Observation and Supervision	1	4
Psychology and Childhood	3	10
Religious Aspects of Contemporary Philosophy	1	4
Training the Devotional Life	1	2
Ethics	2	6
Introduction to Philosophy	1	3
History of Philosophy	1	6
Psychology of Moral Training	1	3
Current Religious Movements	1	2
Aesthetics	1	3
76 Titles	15 Institutions	215 Courses	614.8 Semester Hours

Average number courses offered per institution..... 14.3
Average number semester hours per course 2.86

A critical analysis (Table III) of these courses shows that all 215 of them weighted at 614.8 semester hours can be grouped under ten heads.

TABLE III

Title of Course	*Number of Courses*	*Semester Hours*
Organization and Administration (Church Vacation School Week-Day, Vacation, and Teacher Training Schools Modern Religious Educational Programs Adolescent Programs, Etc.	37	114.4
Psychology of Religion (Psychology of Childhood and Youth Ethics, Socialization of Children, Etc.	37	109.4
Principles of Religious Education (Theory of Religious Education Education in Religious Living)	15	41
Curriculum of Religious Education (Leadership Training Course)	11	37
Worship and Hymnology (Fine Arts in Religious Education Aesthetics, Training the Devotional Life	16	39
Philosophy of Religion (Pragmatism and Religion, Problems of Philosophy Life Ideals of Great Thinkers, Etc.	23	64
Practice Teaching (Observation and Supervision Leadership Problems, Recreational Leadership)	13	44
Religions of the World (Introduction to Study of Religion History and Nature of Religion Literature of the World's Religions, Etc.	18	53
Methods of Teaching (Handcraft, Use of Story, Pageantry and Dramatics Elementary Methods of Teaching, Etc.	33	81
History of Religious Education (Recent Movements in Religious Education Current Religious Momevents)	12	32
10 Titles	215 Courses	614.8 Semester Hours

A major, therefore, according to the quantitative practice of these fifteen institutions, rating no course less than two semester hours, would result as follows:

MAJOR ACCORDING TO FIFTEEN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

Title of Course	*Semester Hours*
1. Organization and Administration	5
2. Psychology of Religion	5
3. Methods of Teaching	4
4. Philosophy of Religion	3
5. The World's Religions	2.5
6. Practice Teaching	2.5
7. Principles of Religious Education	2
8. Worship and Hymnology	2
9. Curriculum of Religious Education	2
10. History of Religious Education	2
Total	30

IN CONCLUSION

In concluding this report it should be said that this Committee has no idea in its effort to discover the proper organization of a major in Religious Education that any standard courses of study or iron-clad curriculum will be the result of its findings. What the Committee has in mind is that certain interest areas in the field of Religious Education will be clearly indicated as best presenting a comprehensive understanding of the issues, principles, and problems of Religious Education, and that these interest areas will likewise be found by experience to be satisfactorily presented through certain teaching units. The items that the Committee will eventually recommend as properly to be included in a helpful organization of a major in Religious Education, will in the practice of the institutions incorporating them in their curricula be highly varied and ought to be, in the interest of experimentation. But the results that will accrue to pupils who have pursued these constituent items in the several institutions will be comparable, in that a comprehensive understanding of the issues, principles, and problems of Religious Education will be common possession of all who have mastered these areas of interest through the various teaching units decided upon in local groups.

TRENDS IN THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT

GARDINER M. DAY

As we begin to write this article the Convocation Week at the Bangor Theological Seminary brings to that institution four distinguished lecturers: Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York, will speak on "Applied Christianity"; Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, President of the Union Theological Seminary, on "Preaching"; Dr. James Moffatt, Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, on "Literature and Life"; and Professor Henry H. Tweedy, Yale Divinity School, on "Personal Religion and the Devotional Life." It certainly must be a magnificent week.

At the same time Melvin Prior and his cohorts are planning the annual Inter-Seminary Conference of New England, which will be held at the Newton Theological Institution on the theme: "Toward a More United Church." The student committee has had the eager cooperation of Dr. Herrick, President of the Newton Theological Institution, and a fine list of speakers has been arranged.

TRENDS FROM CHICAGO

The bulletins of the various seminaries recently have been rife with comment upon modern tendencies in the realm of thought in our seminaries. In an article entitled "Trends in Theological Education" in *The Chicago Theological Seminary Register,* Mr. Arthur L. Holt notes seven distinctive tendencies of to-day in the current seminary thought. He notices a trend in the way seminaries are defining their function. The early seminaries looked upon themselves as the defenders and builders of a certain type of religious tradition, but now the more advanced seminaries are trying to turn out skilled workmen in religious leadership and allowing them to deal in a free way with their tradition. Again, he notes a marked change in the program of the modern seminary. Fifty years ago the entire curriculum was prescribed, but to-day in almost every seminary are found innumerable elective courses. The seminary has become a graduate school in which the student must choose according to his dominant interest.

Further, the old method that dominated teaching was that of the impartation of information, but now the best seminaries are endeavoring to teach the student how to think rather than what to think so that through life they may build up a theology and ethics based on observed experience. In the field of teaching, the practical departments of the seminary, Mr. Holt finds, have fallen behind the historical departments. He says: "So long as we leave this prestige in the hands of the historical disciplines, religion will continue to be classified with archeology, and theological students will know why farmers and villagers staged a revolt in 1000 B. C., but they will be totally oblivious to the rural-urban conflict in 1928." A distinct forward movement, the writer also remarks, is being made along aesthetic lines. Far more real effort than ever before is being made to satisfy the aesthetic and emotional natures of the seminary students in a real attempt to make beauty a vital part of Protestant religion.

Religion and Youth

The new *Bulletin* of the Colgate-Rochester Seminary, which is heir to the *Bulletin* of the aforetime Rochester Theological Seminary, has an extremely interesting and valuable symposium on "The Religion of Youth," arranged by Professor Parsons and written by various younger graduates of that great Baptist seminary. The articles are too long and too diverse to summarize here in any adequate way, but it may be well to mention some of the points of view which seem to be agreed upon by the half dozen contributors.

The consensus of opinion seems to be that youth is religious but that its religion shows itself in a way that is different from the traditional and conventional. The new religion of youth is more of a process of living than a system of belief. It is an adventure and a quest if it is nothing else. The writers also feel that the chief tendency of modern youth is that of revolt from the old formulations of belief and a severe questioning of the validity of any new statements of belief. This results in a general confusion of thought on the part of most young people.

The articles bring out very clearly four facts in regard to youth. In the first place youth has given its allegiance to a

gospel of science rather than a gospel of theology. As Mr. Earl Frederick Adams puts it:

> This is but natural when we consider that our children are taught in school to use the scientific method in the search for truth. They are encouraged to use their reasoning powers and believe in those things which can be verified by experimentation and research. When, therefore, they come to the question of religion, they refuse to leave their intellects on the shelf and believe in that which is contrary to their own experience. What a mistake we have made in letting them think that religion is a matter of mere belief rather than a vital life experience.

Mr. John D. W. Fetter remarks:

> In the present situation no small part is played by the newer method of education. From the nursery school to the research laboratory youth is told to experiment and get first-hand knowledge. Take nothing for granted. Question everything. Verify by experience. Knowledge is no more poured in but tried out. We thus find youth in the trying stage and while many think that his trials have been mostly errors it is too soon to judge what the result will be in his attitude toward religion.

Mr. Fetter goes on to suggest that the remedy is in two things. In the first place, we must more fully recognize and appreciate the questions of youth. We must face them frankly and honestly and think through their problems with them to the beginnings of a philosophy of life. We must be careful to give them something better than the stereotyped answers of the past. In the second place, we must present to youth more visible results or fruits of our religion. Youth believes in science to-day because it sees what science has done and is doing. Youth judges everything by its fruits. Many of the finer results of religion are extremely subtle and are not readily made visible—indeed they can never be made readily visible. Consequently one has to have a deeper insight into life to see spiritual fruits than to see material fruits. Nevertheless there is no doubt but that much could be done by the church to make more visible its values to the eyes of youth.

All the writers agree that the old theology and creeds of the church have caused youth to revolt and youth finds it extremely

difficult to express its religion through existing religious forms or organizations. This has been caused in a large measure because the church has taken the attitude that all truth has been revealed once and for all and that all one has left to do is to appreciate it. Mr. Newton C. Fetter diagnoses the causes of this revolt very clearly in the following sentence:

> The church, still too dogmatic and therefore sectarian; the school, too exclusively devoted to science and to specialization; the community, too much absorbed in money-making and in spending; modern literature, much of it, permeated with the doctrines of behaviorism—in this environment youth is compelled to exercise its powers of appreciation and to discover and appropriate the permanent values of life; under these conditions, youth goes out in search of reality.

Again, the remedy is that religious leaders to-day must have above all a sympathetic attitude. They must be willing to throw into the background their old ideas and if necessary begin over again with youth in an honest attempt to answer his questions and find a new and more secure basis of faith. This may mean that the religious leaders will have to come down from the half-way house on the mountain side of experience and begin the climb again, perhaps blazing a new trail and most certainly with new equipment. Only when this is done will the church and youth be able to ascend the mountain together with understanding and finally to see together the vision at the summit.

These writers on the religion of youth like all writers on Christianity are agreed that while the church may have to endure great changes and transformations and see much that it held valuable in the past discarded entirely, nevertheless there is no danger to the heart of Christianity—that is to the person of Jesus. As Mr. Earl F. Adams expresses it:

> Let the church have no fear for the safety of Jesus. His greatness rises above that of the organized church. It would be easier for His spirit to live anew in the lives of youth if He had not been so thoroughly embalmed by the church fathers. The new religion of youth is not meant to be in opposition to the gospel of Jesus Christ. . . . No, the religion of Jesus is not in danger—but the Christian Church is.

Finally, Mr. Newton C. Fetter very pertinently emphasizes the fact that the present difficulties which youth finds with religion or with the church will only be solved when the church sends to its students its best leaders. Let us conclude this article by quoting his words directly:

> There are comparatively few religious leaders who are employed to give their entire attention to youth, particularly to young people between the ages of eighteen to twenty-five which, by the way, is proof that the church, like our industrial system, "is not organized in the interest of young life and its development." Youth must subsist, so far as religious nurture is concerned, on odds and ends. If he feeds on husks in a far country it may be because he was fed on husks at home. Ministers are hard pressed by the elders for sermons, speeches, committee meetings. Many of them do not find time to devote, either to the young people already in the church, or to others who might be won. A Presbyterian clergyman in a town where I once lived was considered "unusual" because he knew most of the high school boys, took an interest in their activities, helped to provide them with a club house, and conducted his services on Sunday with them particularly in mind. All of which took time out of a busy career. From the point of view of church statistics, it was mostly wasted time; from the point of view of influence over youth, it was worth all of the effort it demanded, both for the boys and for Dr. Labaree.

A recent letter from a successful college president says: "Incidentally you may be interested in the rapidity with which problems multiply for College Presidents. I am just finishing twenty years as President of ————————. In that time the student body has increased from 187 to 715; the faculty from 13 to 44; the yearly maintenance from $35,000 to $220,000; the endowment from $170,000 to $1,000,000. In addition to the running expenses of the institution there was raised for endowment and equipment $1,697,000."

THE WORKER'S BOOKSHELF

The New Morality, Durant Drake (Macmillan, $2.50). The most important recent book in this field. The university worker could plan a semester's discussions around the questions raised in these chapters. Almost every page bristles with significant problems and suggestions. The volume is not iconoclastic; it is honest, clear, constructive. Morality is conceived in terms of the greatest good to the greatest number; it is not authoritarian, it is based upon observable results of conduct. The discussion includes, in excellent summary fashion: a scientific conception of morality; fifteen specific problems of modern morals (such as marital failures, selfish business, race prejudice, etc.); and a concluding section which deals with moral progress and reform.—*H. T. S.*

* * * * *

Taking the Name of Science in Vain, Horace J. Bridges (Macmillan, $2.50). Mr. Bridges essays a refutation of the "happiness of the greatest number" theory of morality, held by Mr. Drake, and of the position held by all utilitarian hedonists. His volume is a philosophical rebuttal of Watson's behaviorism and of mechanism. The author is the well-known leader of the Chicago Ethical Society—a logical thinker, and a keen student of literature and science.—*H. T. S.*

* * * * *

Methods of Private Religious Living, H. N. Wieman (Macmillan, $1.75). This is a book for those who want to experience religion and not merely talk about it. The author discusses the specific ways by which the individual may gain the resources which come from religion. It is, at heart, a consideration of the necessity and technique of private worship, although the chapters of the book reach beyond the narrow confines usually involved in the idea of "devotions." One should read the volume slowly, and then should try for himself the suggestions of technique offered by the author. This is a very important book. Its chapter headings are: Private worship, religious release of energy, reconstructing society, method of dealing with common things, meeting a crisis, public worship, fellowship, finding joy in life, methods of mysticism, and method in religion.—*H. T. S.*

Religion Coming of Age, Roy W. Sellars (Macmillan, $2.50). This is a frank and clear statement of the position of naturalistic humanism, as opposed to theism. The first part of the book traces the development of religion; this is followed by a similar treatment of historical Christianity; and the last chapters deal with the fundamental philosophical questions with which religion and philosophy are concerned. Philosophical humanism does not find warrant for, or need of, immortality. It does not discover that man has a "cosmic companion." Religion concerns itself with values; it "is self-conscious, human life functioning in the face of its problems. It is the setting up of objectives and courage in their pursuit." While to many readers the book will seem more effective in showing the inadequacies even of liberal Christianity than in formulating a more satisfactory religious viewpoint, a careful reading will convince the student that Mr. Sellars is deeply concerned with the problems of mankind and has outlined an attitude which must be considered by intelligent leaders who want the religion of tomorrow to be sufficient to the world's needs.—*H. T. S.*

The Chicago Theological Seminary
(Founded in 1855)

A graduate school for the training of leaders in all branches of Christian service. Affiliated with the University of Chicago. Courses open to men and women.

Full catalog furnished on request.

OZORA S. DAVIS, President
FRANK G. WARD, Dean

5757 University Avenue, Chicago

The Effective College

A book of 300 pages, setting forth the most approved ideals and procedure regarding curricula, faculty-student relations, effective teaching, promotion of scholarship, the place of religion and the fine arts in education, and the problems of finance. **Price, $2.00 per copy. Published by the Association of American Colleges, 111 Fifth Ave., New York. For Table of Contents see March issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, pp. 407–408.**

The Westminster Teachers' Bureau

Secures suitable teachers, officers and helpers for schools, colleges and universities—private, public and denominational—and assists trained, capable, teachers and other workers to suitable fields of service. THE WESTMINSTER SERVICE BUREAU (under same management) secures for institutions secretaries, librarians, business managers, dietitians, financial secretaries and other helpers.. We now have enrolled many capable, thoroughly prepared and experienced workers. Service is free to institutions and at three-fifths the usual charge to teachers and workers.

HENRY H. SWEETS, Manager

410 Urban Building, Louisville, Ky.

The Biblical Seminary in New York

Wilbert W. White, President

SUMMER TERM, JUNE 19--JULY 30, 1929

Courses for Pastors, College and Seminary Professors, Directors of Religious Education, Theological Students, Missionaries, and other Christian Leaders and Workers.

Term Divided Into Two Periods of Three Weeks Each.

For full information and schedule, address

Walter E. Bachman, Dean, 235 E. 49th St., New York

(Send for full Catalogue of Seminary. Five Departments.)